THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak

VOL. 109, NO. 14 NEW YORK, MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1943 NUMBER 1505

The Allies and Italian Politics

Churchill's speech before Parliament answered some questions about the war in Italy, but failed to give to some others replies that will be satisfactory to British or American liberal opinion. He said the invasion of the Italian mainland was set at the earliest moment it was militarily possible. It was not delayed because of negotiations with Badoglio or for any other reason. Mussolini could not be handed over to the Allies because to do so would have revealed to the Germans the fact that secret armistice negotiations were under way. His Italian guards had orders to shoot him if he attempted an escape, and they disregarded these orders. Someone bungled very badly, but there is no evidence that it was the Allies.

The United Nations are evidently backing Badoglio and the King to the limit. Said Mr. Churchill:

> It is necessary in the general interest as well as in that of Italy that all surviving forces in Italy's national life should be rallied together around the government and that the King and Marshal Badoglio should be supported by whatever liberal and left-wing elements are capable of making headway against the Nazi Quisling gang and thus drive this villainous combination from Italian soil, or better still, annihilate it on the spot.
>
> This of course without the slightest prejudice to the untrammeled right of the Italian people to make whatever arrangement it chooses for the future government of the country on democratic lines when peace and tranquility are restored.

Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary, made a similar declaration one day later, saying that the Allies want to see in Italy a government broadly based, including representatives of all parties except of course the Fascists themselves.

"Darlanism" in Italy

Refugee Italian liberals now in the United States are protesting as strongly as possible against the support of the Badoglio regime that is offered by Mr. Churchill. They charge that Count Sforza, the outstanding Italian liberal now available, was for some time refused permission, by the British, to return to his homeland. They recite the facts of the many years' collaboration by both the King and Badoglio with Mussolini and insist that the overwhelming majority of the Italian people want nothing to do with either of them. To the argument that Badoglio gave us the Italian fleet and Sardinia, and helped in the conquest of Corsica, which should be completed a few days hence, these liberals reply that the Italian soldiers and sailors were most anxious to come over to our side and would have obeyed anybody with as much or more readiness. Indeed, these liberals charged that our political ineptitude in Italy is losing us great numbers of invaluable allies at the moment when they could be of maximum usefulness to us.

A Bad Policy, or None?

It is obvious that in handling the political side of relations with Italy the Allies were faced with most difficult problems. No doubt a certain proportion of the population is politically unstable, cheering for whichever side at any moment seems most likely to win, or to occupy the area where the cheerer resides. It is very

CONTENTS

The Week 439
Editorial
Wilkie as Candidate 442
General Articles
Britain and Her Colonies . . . J. T. Harris 444
Franco Prepares to Change Sides . . . . . Heinz H. F. Eulau 446
The Utilities' Swollen Profits . . . . . Richard J. Beamish 448
British Labor Takes Stock . Charles Madge 451
The Abolition of the Plow . H. H. Bennett 453
Labors' Post-War Plans . . . Helen Fuller 454
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 456
Exterior Decorating . . . . Manny Farber 457
Brood of Glory . . . . . Stark Young 457
A Communication . . . Henry David Gray 458
The Bandwagon 459
Correspondence 460
Books in Review
The Great American Desert . Isaac Rosenfeld 461
China Today . . . . . Kate L. Mitchell 462
Novels and Negroes . . . Thomas Sancton 463
Money and Men . . . . . Stuart Chase 464
Renaissance of Christianity . Raphael Demos 465
A Reader's List 466

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficult for the military mind to think of large masses of troops as being enemies today and friends tomorrow. The generals in command had to reckon, moreover, with the possibility that among the Italian troops as they surrendered there might be some still loyal to the Nazis and capable of acts of treachery to us. The military men's view of the usefulness of Italian reinforcements was probably colored by a low estimate of their fighting qualities—an unfair estimate, when you remember that for twenty years Italians have fought only for causes regarding which most of them were evidently lukewarm or secretly hostile.

It is easy to make excuses for the military men who are on the ground; but it is harder to make excuses for the British and American governments. Either they have had no Italian policy up to now, or they have had none that they dared announce publicly either to their own people or to the Italians. Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Churchill's expressions in their speeches have consisted of pious platitudes which meant very little when put alongside the fact that we are building up the prestige of Badoglio and the King in such a way that it will be very hard for the Italians to get rid of them when the fighting stops, if it turns out, as it doubtless will, that to get rid of them is what the mass of the population desires.

Germans out of Russia?

Is Germany conducting a planned retreat in Russia? Or is she being pushed backward against her will by the onsurging Russian troops? Until a few days ago it seemed certain that the former was the case. As far back as last spring, well placed military observers predicted that Germany would retire this fall to a line roughly that of the old eastern border of Poland and Rumania. She would do this, not in order to shorten her line from north to south—a line that is now about a hundred miles longer than it was a month ago. She would do it to shorten her east-west communications and supply lines. A munitions train from Berlin can make the round trip to the Polish border in about two days; but the round trip to Stalingrad formerly required a week. Thus the shortened line would enable the Germans to transport the same quantity of supplies with perhaps half as much rolling stock—and Germany has a bad shortage of freight cars and especially locomotives. To support the argument of voluntary retirement is the great speed of the Russian advance and the fact that comparatively few prisoners have been taken. Against it is the capture by the Russians here and there of substantial amounts of supplies.

It is important for us to recognize that the German armies are still retreating, and are not being destroyed. If we don't we may be in for a bitter disappointment a little later on. There is no evidence as yet that the Germans are incapable of making a stand at some predetermined point; there is no real evidence that they wanted to do so on the Dnieper. The ferocity with which the Germans have been fighting around Naples is sufficient evidence that the Nazis are not in a state of collapse: you could hardly fight that well in one area and be utterly demoralized in another. The best military guess seems to be that the Germans are shortening their lines in the east and will then make a determined stand. By doing so, however, they expose themselves more than ever to aerial bombing; before long every inch of German soil will be within easy bomber range for the Allies. Of our final victory, there is no longer any doubt. The only question is how long it will take and whether by our political ineptitude we are postponing the success of our arms.

Before the Three Power Conference

Diplomatic relations between Russia and her Western allies seem to be reaching some sort of climax. The Interallied Mediterranean Commission, of which Russia is a member, will soon be a reality. A. J. Vishinsky, Soviet Vice-Commissar for Foreign Affairs, will sit on behalf of the USSR. The meeting of Foreign Ministers of Russia, Great Britain and the United States will take place soon in Moscow. If it is true that the Russians urged the choice of that city partly in the hope that Secretary Hull would be unable to travel so far and would be replaced by someone more amenable, they may be disappointed. Late reports from Washington indicate that the Secretary is determined to go. Reports from London say that an Allied invasion of Yugoslavia is being held up pending political agreements among the Allies which will persuade the rival forces in that area to stop fighting each other and combine against the Germans.

It cannot be repeated too often that there are no differences between Russia and the Western democracies that are incapable of solution. At the same time we should recognize flatly that these differences do exist, and are serious. With Americans it is always either a feast or a famine: while one section of our public opinion is implacably hostile to Russia, another proposes to give her more than seems reasonable. It is a pity that we cannot face some of the facts realistically: 1. Russia will never be wholly satisfied with our war effort, nor we with hers. It just is not in the nature of allies to achieve any such millennium. 2. Russia will certainly have a great deal to say about the future of Eastern Europe after the war, and it is doubtful whether we could stop her, even if we wanted to. 3. Russia will not go to war with Japan for any altruistic reasons but only if she thinks it is strongly in her interest to do so. 4. It would be a very bad mistake to assume that Russia is, or soon will be, "bled white" and unable to play an important role in world affairs. Russia after all has a much greater population (including the areas overrun by Germany) than the United States and Great Britain combined, and her economy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not subject to the serious wastes that seem to be inevitable in the organization of the democracies. For our own sake and the sake of the future, we had better enter our negotiations with Russia prepared to give as well as to take.

The President Does Some Juggling

Sweeping changes in and around the State Department have been announced by President Roosevelt. Sumner Welles's resignation is at last made official; we are sorry that his wife's illness should be brought forward as an excuse, when everyone knows that Mr. Hull forced him out. He is succeeded by Edward R. Stettinius Jr., now Lend-Lease Administrator. An Office of Foreign Economic Administration, headed by Leo T. Crowley, will be set up to combine the offices of lend-lease, foreign relief and rehabilitation, and economic warfare. This new office is not under the State Department, but the White House. Former Gov. Herbert Lehman, now head of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, becomes an assistant to the President and will presumably take charge of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation work when this gets under way.

These moves are on the whole much better than was expected. Mr. Hull gets his way in regard to Mr. Welles, but he loses from the State Department all the important international economic activities on which he had set his heart, and for which he hardly seems a good administrator. Mr. Stettinius, former head of U. S. Steel, is a liberal business man and a good friend of Russia. If Averell Harriman becomes Ambassador to Moscow, these two sensible American industrialists working together should do much to dispel the clouds over Russo-American relations created by diplomats with special and peculiar ideas of their own. It is common sense to bring together lend-lease, relief and economic warfare under one head, and Mr. Crowley has made a good record as an administrator. Many of Mr. Roosevelt's reorganizations in the past have failed to stick; but this one seems likely to do so.

Marshall and MacArthur

At this writing it is still uncertain whether General Marshall will go to London or stay in Washington, will command the army invading Western Europe, or lead all British-American forces throughout the world, or continue as United States Chief of Staff. The best use to be made of any individual is obviously a matter for the President and the Prime Minister and their immediate advisers, and should not become a question of public controversy. Someone must have bungled badly to permit the matter to get into the public press at all.

Something else which should not have seen the light of day was General MacArthur's statement that if he had to be subordinate to Lord Louis Mountbatten he would be a good soldier and do his best. In the first place, all available evidence indicates he is not subordinate to Lord Mountbatten; as someone has said, there is a thousand miles of room, and the enemy, between their spheres of operation. In the second place, no general should issue a public statement that he will be good and obey orders. Up to now we have taken it for granted that General MacArthur was the victim of malicious and irresponsible American reactionaries who were putting his name into politics against his will. We hope his future conduct will prove, despite this disturbing recent pronunciamento, that our earlier assumption was correct.

Has the Legion Changed Its Spots?

The American Legion at its Omaha convention passed one resolution for which liberals can cheer. It denounced Ham Fish for permitting his franking privilege to be used to disseminate propaganda inimical to the United States. The Legion was also anti-isolationist —or at least as much so as the Republicans were at Mackinac Island. It advocated freeing the invaded nations, punishing those who started the war and having America join in creating and maintaining world peace. Must we conclude then that the Legion has changed its spots? We know no evidence that it has. It supports the President as Commander-in-Chief and not as leader of the New Deal. As far as we know, it remains anti-labor and, on the whole, anti-liberal. It seems to us probable that returning soldiers who are political and social progressives will do better to have an organization of their own than to yield to the present strong blandishments of the Legion and try to fight from within.

Still Appeasing Vichy?

I. F. Stone, in PM, reveals that pressure by Secretary Hull forced an unwilling Treasury Department to release $200,000 in frozen funds to the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique (the French Line) whose headquarters are in occupied France. This action enabled the French Line to set up an American subsidiary to manage and operate French ships taken over in the North African invasion. "The shipping agreement,"

Drawing by Eric Godal. Copyright, 1943, by Field Publications and reprinted by courtesy of PM.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stone reports, "like the release of frozen funds, was made against the written objections of the United States Treasury, which had investigated the operations of the French Line in this country during the Vichy period and called its head, Henri Morin de Linclays, 'politically untrustworthy'." The Treasury's characterization of de Linclays is understatement; the man whom Mr. Hull has befriended, it appears, purged the company of pro-United Nations executives, denounced Vichy sailors who had gone over to the American or British service, and in letters turned up by Treasury officials branded himself as an anti-Semite.

The United Nations Start Work

Our national program for international relief and rehabilitation has marked time for many months now. Always the excuse has been that a United Nations relief organization was soon to be created which would absorb our present program and machinery. That has now come to pass. The creation of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is of major importance not only because it will carry food, medicine and other things to war-torn areas, but more especially because it marks the first time the four chief Allied powers have joined together on one job in a way that sets precedents both for war and post-war. The UNRRA has done almost nothing as yet. The whole task of how to weave the smaller nations into the structure remains to be figured out. In all probability the American candidate for International Director will be Herbert Lehman, and in all probability he will win the appointment. If so, he will need to devote special energy to the Commitee on Supplies, where the smaller countries will be most able to make their point of view known, and where Lehman might be able to do most toward the development of foreign production of food and other resources. The groundwork for a new international pattern of collaboration will be laid in this program.

Keeping Congress Clean

Both Attorney General Francis Biddle and Speaker Sam Rayburn are still on the spot with reference to Rep. Gene Cox's special committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission. After months of complete silence from the Department of Justice as to why no effort has been made to obtain an indictment against Cox for having accepted a fee for representing his home-town radio station before a federal agency, Biddle recently cracked down on another Representative, James Michael Curley of Boston, for using the United States mails to conduct a war-contract racket. Biddle will not be bothered with many prominent apologists for Curley, whose questionable financial habits have brought him two previous criminal indictments. Many people in Washington are commenting on the sharp difference between the Attorney General's speed in the Curley case and his dilatoriness in regard to Cox. In any event, the persecution of the FCC that Cox has been conducting in the guise of an investigation is bringing such disrepute to the whole House and to the whole congressional investigating machinery that it is no longer possible to shrug the case off lightly.

Commissioner Clifford J. Durr of the FCC is insisting that his petition against the continuance of Cox as chairman of the investigating committee receive congressional attention. The House Judiciary Committee, to which Speaker Rayburn referred Durr's petition almost four months ago, has now denied that it has jurisdiction in the matter. It is again up to the Speaker, who must now show where he stands. He could simply remove Cox from the position to which he should never have been appointed, or else he could place the petition and the whole Cox case before the House for action. In that case, we cannot believe that the House of Representatives would vote to retain Cox as chairman, or even as a member, of this committee in which he obviously has a highly personal interest.

Willkie as Candidate

No one could have been surprised when Wendell Willkie, with characteristic derring-do, threw his hat into a presidential ring handsomely prepared for him by Look Magazine and its owner, Gardner Cowles Jr. It has long been known that Willkie was a candidate for the Republican nomination. But the point of dramatic interest in Willkie's statement lay in its timing and in its candor. It was timed as an answer to the Mackinac Conference, staged by the Republican National Committee, which so sedulously immunized the other Republicans from Willkie's political leprosy. And while Willkie's statement still leaves some of the most answerable questions unanswered, it shines among the timidities of his Republican rivals, such as Dewey and Bricker, much as Shakespeare said a good deed shines in a naughty world. Not since William Jennings Bryan's second and third tries for the presidency has there been such pre-convention explicitness in a candidate.

There are five planks in his platform. First, he will be a candidate "if the Republican Party intends to drive heart and soul for liberal objectives." Second, his liberal objectives are protection for minorities, governmental efficiency and administrative overhauling, lower prices and economic expansion as deeds on the part of business in place of their harping on "free enterprise," absolute guarantees against unemployment, taking social insurance out of politics, and the formulation of a new foreign policy. Third, he believes in a foreign policy that will recognize that isolationism will lead inevitably to another war, and he would replace the balance-of-power system by something else. Fourth, he calls on the Republicans to rebuild their own party

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from within, and make it the liberal party. Fifth, he urges that America's immediate task is to repair the blunders on the home front, win the war and look ahead to a future in which "free men all over the earth can stand together."

It is obvious from this recital—which we have tried to make as faithful as possible—what Willkie's tactic is. He knows that to win in 1944 he must be different from the Willkie of 1940, and he knows that if he is to be different he must beat the Republican Party machine. His best hope is therefore a grass-roots Republican movement of the rank and file, and the fact that he wants to reach the Midwest farmers rather than the business group is symbolized by his using Look for his message instead of one of the Luce publications. To get this rank-and-file support he aims to capitalize on the dawning sense of international responsibility among Americans—a sense which he himself helped awaken. But to win he must also capture elements of the Roosevelt support—the labor vote, the Negro vote, the Jewish vote. If he can show that he has a fair prospect of making heavy inroads into these, he may convince the Republican convention and the party leaders that they cannot win without him.

To talk of his tactic in this fashion does not in any sense slur his sincerity. In politics a strategy may be based on sincerity or insincerity, but in either event it remains a strategy. We believe that in the past three years Willkie's views have changed considerably, and that he has not remained unaffected by the shattering events of a world whose foundations have crumbled. But we believe also that the lights and shades in the portrait of the new Willkie have been put in with an eye to the effect on the beholder.

Willkie is at his best in his grasp of the global character of the post-war era—in fighting the isolationism still so rampant in his own party, in pointing out the treacherous pitfalls inherent in a balance-of-power policy. He is also at his best in his convictions about civil liberties at home. Where he is weakest is in his vagueness about the sort of policy he would follow either in international or domestic affairs. To strike out against isolationism, and against the opportunism of Roosevelt's present foreign policy, is splendid—but it remains negative. To speak of "free men all over the earth" is fine, but it remains rhetoric. Willkie has not breathed a word about international cartels, which Wallace has put his finger on as the crux of the post-war economic problem. He has said nothing explicit about where he would stand in the struggle to carry through the democratic revolutions in Europe.

In domestic matters it takes courage for a Republican to say that some of the big corporations are "the worst enemies of free enterprise." But it would have been important to know how the problem of corporate power and corporate tyranny—the overwhelming domestic problem in America—will be met. It is fine to say that we must have an absolute guarantee against unemployment; but it would have been better to be told how this guarantee could be achieved without vast government spending and administrative controls. And only those have the right to castigate the "home front" who pay the price of being specific about where the confusion and waste lie, and how they can be remedied. One must recall that in the fight within the OWI which caused the resignation of some of its best people, the role of Gardner Cowles Jr., the impresario of Willkie's campaign, was certainly not conspicuously liberal or democratic. If these are the men who would be Willkie's liberal lieutenants in Washington, the home front would not have much to recommend it.

Despite these criticisms, it remains true that Willkie himself is a dramatic figure who has during the past three years been a healthy force in American opinion, has struggled valiantly to sweep out the anachronistic ideas that have cluttered the lumber-room of the Republican mind, and has been a challenge to Roosevelt not to betray his liberal past.

The real difficulties of Willkie as a President could come in the group with whom he would have to work. A victory for the Republicans—even with Willkie as standard-bearer—would mean that the new Congress would (if possible) be even worse than the present one. If Willkie sought to win over the reactionaries in his party, he would become their prisoner. If he pressed his liberalism, the newspapers would turn bitterly against him. His sin would be even greater than Roosevelt's has been—for Willkie would have added to the injury of reform the insult of betraying his own party. The American promise lies in pitting against the oppressive power of big corporate enterprise the collective power of the people as expressed through a militant administration. Anyone unwilling to undertake the task of taming and controlling that power will be ineffective, no matter how deep his concern about minority rights or international understanding.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain and Her Colonies

"WHAT WE HAVE WE HOLD—if we can get it back again," is the way a British newspaper summed up Colonel Blimp's view of the future of the colonial empire. It will also serve as a fairly accurate description of the government's policy on colonies as it emerged in a recent discussion in the House of Commons. The government is willing to advance social and economic measures for the improvement of colonial life, and is entertaining a plan for the development of higher education. There is even the possibility that Britain would sanction the formation of international commissions for certain areas in which countries possessing colonies would be represented, along with nations holding only an economic stake in those regions. But the British would insist on having the final word as far as their own colonies are concerned. There will be no worldwide internationalization of colonies if the present government can help it.

Of the 500,000,000 people in the British Empire, Great Britain and the dominions—that is, the Commonwealth proper—account for about 70,000,000. The dominions are independent states in all but name; they share the King with us as the symbol of the State, but they have their own governments, with complete freedom not only to run their own internal affairs, but also to have their own tariffs, currencies, foreign policies, flags and diplomatic representation abroad.

The Irish Free State regards itself as a European small nation isolated equally from the Continent and the British Commonwealth, and is neutral in this war.

The Union of South Africa is in the war, but only by narrow parliamentary majorities. South Africa is concerned almost entirely with extending her power and influence on the African continent, where her color bar and racial-domination policies, similar in spirit to those of the Southern states in the USA, are increasingly likely to clash with British and other European policies looking to colonial emancipation and racial equality.

Canada, New Zealand and Australia are at least as close to the United States today on matters of defense, foreign policy and economic development as they are to the mother country.

In all the dominions, industry has developed tremendously under the stimulus of war. Taken with the operations of Lend-Lease and the economic relationships that will grow out of international relief and reconstruction policies conducted by the United Nations, these developments mean that there will be no chance of maintaining any form of imperial preference after the war.

India accounts for some 350,000,000 of the 500,000,000 in the Empire. And India is going to get her independence after the war. Not, to be sure, if our Tories can help it. The arguments of Mr. Amery and the other die-hards, if taken at their face value, namely that we have done all that we can, and everything now depends on the Moslems and Hindus getting together—could be used just as well after the war to bilk Britain's promise to the Indians as they are being used today to excuse the failure to make any real effort to end the present deadlock. The government is only getting away with this half-truth today because the feeling is so strong both in India and in this country that we cannot afford a major row with our Tories and die-hards until we have won the war. But the minute hostilities are over, the government will have to carry out its promise to India, or do a lot of hard fighting to hold down the Indian people, in the face of Chinese, Russian and American disapproval. And the people of this country will be in no mood to stand for any such policy. Rather than sanction coercion and bloodshed in the name of law and order, they would be in favor of clearing out, bag and baggage, and letting the Indians fight it out among themselves. That is why whatever British government we have at the end of the war is likely to make good its promise to India, rather than to court disaster by being stubborn.

The colonial empire proper numbers some 60,000,000 in Asia, America and Africa. The future of the British colonies on the Asiatic continent—Burma, Malaya, Hong Kong—cannot be separated from that of their neighbors, Siam and French Indo-China, nor from that of the Dutch East Indies and the Philippines. These countries have been overrun by Japan, partly by the help of Japanese appeals to native nationalism against Western imperialism. The fact that the Japanese have instead imposed a much worse form of imperialism does not make the natives long for a return of their white rulers, but on the contrary stimulates their nationalism. Most of these communities already enjoyed some self-government and were pressing for a great deal more. According to Chungking newspapers quoted in the British press, the Chinese government, as the principal Asiatic power after the downfall of Japan, will not accept any solution of the problem of the future of these countries that is not worked out in agreement with China, and is opposed to the return of their colonial status. In any case the liberation of these countries from Japan will be at least as much due to Chinese and American forces as to British.

Clearly imperialism in the Far East will have to be wound up after this war: Japanese imperialism smashed Western imperialism, and when it is crushed in its turn, there will have to be new arrangements based on equality of status, international coöperation and national independence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak

Of the other Crown colonies, such communities as Ceylon and the West Indies enjoy a certain measure of self-government, and are urgent to obtain more. Self-government is desired by the populations concerned largely in order to fight against poverty.

In Africa the demand for self-government is less urgent, whereas the problems of poverty and exploitation, forced labor, access to the land and similar issues bulk even larger. The collapse of the Italian empire, the freeing of Ethiopia and the virtual independence of the French colonial empire from the metropolis (or rather its elevation to the status of representing, and to some extent replacing, Metropolitan France) have set in motion forces that will make it almost impossible to return to the pre-war state of affairs.

Coöperation between Britain and the dominions has got thoroughly mixed up with Anglo-American coöperation. The independence of India and the liquidation of colonial imperialism in Asia are clearly matters of international concern, to be dealt with jointly by the big four in the United Nations as part of the peace settlement and of reconstruction. The only solution would seem to be maintaining coöperation among all the English-speaking nations within the framework of some new world organization, which would include and underpin the newborn independence of India, Malaya, Burma, the Dutch East Indies, the Philippines and French Indo-China, and the restored independence of Siam, and would through international agencies supply them with the resources, technical advice and assistance they need for their national development.

Other communities such as Cyprus, Ceylon and the West Indies are ripe for an immediate and substantial advance toward self-government. Their economic development too should be part of the international economic planning put in hand by the United Nations. (There would be a good deal to be said for allowing the population of Cyprus to vote on whether it wished to join the Greek Republic; Hong Kong should be returned to Chinese sovereignty, and Singapore become the District of Columbia of an Asiatic Council including China, India, Great Britain, the USSR and the United States, and functioning within a world organization.)

The Labor Party recently presented a well-thought-out scheme for applying the so-called mandates principle to all non-self-governing colonies, which is of particular importance in connection with Africa. The colonial powers at the end of the last war accepted certain principles for administering the territories they took from their enemies, and agreed to submit annual reports to a committee appointed by the Council of the League on how they were applying these principles. The Labor proposal is that the acceptance of international trusteeship should be made universal, that is, should apply to all communities unable to govern themselves. But they ask that the principles of colonial policy should be more amply and clearly defined, and should include the abolition of the color bar, and specific obligations to educate and prepare native populations for self-government. They demand that the international authority charged with supervising the way these principles are applied should have the power to send agents to investigate conditions on the spot, as well as to receive petitions from the inhabitants. Finally they propose that the principle of equal access for the commerce of all nations to the mandated territories should be converted into a positive obligation to cooperate in the economic development of these territories, including the raising of their social, health and educational standards, the encouragement of trade unions and coöperative movements and other measures for fitting these communities to take their place in the modern world. That view of the way to convert colonial imperialism into organized internationalism, and exploitation into equality of status, certainly represents a policy that would be endorsed by the great majority of the people of this country.

There remains the question of how this policy should be applied. The Labor report comes out against the idea of international administration in the sense of government by committees of the national officials of several sovereign states. The objections to this form of administration, as exemplified, for instance, by Tangier, are strong.

General Smuts has proposed a limited form of internationalism, namely that the United States and the dominions should share in the administration of the British colonial empire, but the dominions apparently doing so only in the continents with which they were particularly associated. This idea is not popular here. The Tories do not like it, for Blimpish reasons. The Left does not like it, because it fears and distrusts American and South African imperialism quite as much as our own, and thinks it is even worse in its attitude to colored folk, trade unions and government control of industry and trade.

Nevertheless it is ludicrous to believe that the Colonial Office could cope with the urgent and tremendous problems of change that will arise. The Civil Service as a whole is due for a drastic overhaul. It is all right for administering established routines in a "negative" state; it is hopelessly unfit to carry out bold reforms and to cope with economic and social tasks of the "positive" state. But about the worst part of the Civil Service is the Colonial Office (except for the India Office, which is on its way out anyway, and the Foreign Office, which has a place apart cheek by jowl with the State Department). It was a mid-Victorian Radical who said that the colonial empire was a vast system of outdoor relief for the younger sons of the nobility, and this tradition has lingered. The Colonial Secretary, Mr. Oliver Stanley, has been pushed into a series of big jobs and been a respectable failure in each, for no apparent reason except that he is the son of the Earl of Derby. His undersecretary is the Duke

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Devonshire. . . . The whole Office breathes an atmosphere of complacent futility, of not so much hypocritical as fatuous self-satisfaction with policies of too little and too late, of monumental incompetence in face of a world where the old order is being shaken to pieces, and vast new forces are stirring.

No; if we mean business with liquidating imperialism and substituting internationalism, it is not enough to adopt a colonial charter, to put its application under international supervision and to make the economic and social development of colonies part and parcel of the reconstruction policies of the United Nations. We must also make experiments in genuine international administration, beginning with training international staffs of health officials and education officers of experts on different aspects of social welfare, on trade-union and coöperative development, etc., and putting them to work throughout colonial Africa, under the direct authority of the Colonial Charter Commission. We should train and incorporate in these services increasing numbers of the natives themselves. The two things desperately needed in the Empire, if we are to reform it out of existence, are a new administrative machine, manned largely by colonial peoples themselves, and a stiff injection of democracy.

London J. T. HARRIS

Franco Prepares to Change Sides

After four years of "national reconstruction" Franco's fascist regime continues on its dreary road toward delayed bankruptcy. The Spanish cockpit does not even have the glamor which for so long bedeviled the peoples of Germany and Italy. At the most it is a cheap burlesque whose dimmed-out lights are kept burning with American oil. Its audience is an apathetic and depressed people, too exhausted either to cheer or to protest. Its backers are alternately German "tourists" or Anglo-American appeasers. The show which opened seven years ago through Axis promotion and the "non-intervention" of cowardly democratic critics, is overdue for an early closing.

Backstage, fascist Spain is a vast concentration camp, for those actually imprisoned no more than for those who have the dubious privilege of being "free." Today, more than four years after the civil war, Spanish prisons are still crowded with men and women whose only crime was the defense of the democratic Republic. In recent months a number of political prisoners have been released, only to make room for other opponents of the fascist regime. The tight Spanish censorship does not permit an accurate appraisal of how active the opposition is, but it may be conjectured from the law of March 16, 1943, which threatens with severe punishment "rumor-mongers, conspirators, those possessing firearms without licenses, saboteurs, including political strikers, and those who injure persons or cause damage to property with political, social and terrorist motives." Franco's recent babbling about "unity" betrays the fact that he is fearful of the opposition and anxious to win popular favor.

Franco has good reason to fear the Spanish people, who today are worse off than they ever were. The blatant incompetence of the fascist government has prevented economic recovery. Once flourishing industries are not producing, for lack of skilled workers who, if not killed in the war or in exile, languish in prison camps. Agriculture suffers from a shortage of adequate farm machinery. Broken-down communications and a faulty food-distribution system cause large sectors of the population to live on the verge of starvation. There is widespread unemployment because of an unsolved manpower problem and more than a million people are kept going by a skimpy state charity. Disease is rampant because of a shortage of doctors and medical supplies. Juvenile delinquency in the cities has increased beyond anything previously known. Schools are closed for the lack of teachers most of whom had been Republicans and now are *persona non grata*. In short, Franco's Spain has all the trimmings of fascism but none of the illusory compensations which for a long time befogged the people in Germany and Italy.

Preparation for war was the dynamic principle of German and Italian fascism. The tremendous energies unleashed there for the purpose of war mobilization are nonexistent in Franco's Spain. The Franco regime has no political objective to inspire the people. It symbolizes the artificially revived rule of the world's blackest clergy, most reactionary army and most degenerate nobility. Self-perpetuation is the only aim of this triarchy. Its doom is postponed only by the brutalitarian methods of the Falange, which has succeeded in keeping the revolutionary Spanish proletariat and peasantry in a state of terror and subjugation.

But the Franco regime stands on feet of clay. Symptomatic of its internal weakness are the repeated rumors of a restoration of the monarchy under Franco's auspices. It is difficult to see how a Franco-engineered restoration would make the regime any stronger or more popular. The Spanish monarchy is thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the people, who did not get rid of the king in 1931 in order to have him back a dozen years later as a fascist puppet. If under a restored monarchy free elections were held, an event which is quite unthinkable, it is certain that the people would sweep the king from his prefabricated throne.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As Franco's continued usurpation of power depends on the aid and comfort he receives from foreign nations, the restoration can only have the purpose of preparing the ground for his deserting the sinking Axis ship and jumping on the United Nations bandwagon. Franco sees the handwriting on the wall. While he may still be sending token forces to fight with the Germans on the Russian front, while he may grant military concessions to the Germans in Spain, and while he may engage in occasional anti-democratic outbursts, Franco realizes in which direction the wind is blowing. He also knows that if he wants to stay in power, he must play ball with the United Nations.

Franco will have little trouble in shifting his allegiance to the side of the United Nations. He has always had many influential friends in the American State Department and the British Foreign Office. Not only does he enjoy their tacit support, but he has their frank promise that his regime will not be disturbed by United Nations intervention after the war. In the early part of this year American Ambassador Carlton Hayes, in an astonishing burst of generosity which presumably had the consent of responsible State Department officials, severely jolted democratic hopes for an early overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Spain. As reported in The New York Times of January 16, 1943, Hayes declared that "if the political and social institutions of this country undergo change or modification in future years, it will be the work of Spaniards within Spain—not of the United States or Spanish emigrés." In other words, the liquidation of Hitler and Mussolini will not necessarily mean the demise of General Franco.

But the Spanish people inside Spain, contrary to Mr. Hayes's divinations, have no chance to revolt as long as Franco is sustained by his friends in Washington and London. The Spanish population is unarmed and unorganized. Its militants are in jail. Its leaders are dead or in exile. The worst thing that could happen to the people of Spain and the cause of Spanish democracy would be Franco's joining the United Nations. To forestall this is today the first imperative of a unified Spanish Republican movement in exile.

Unfortunately, Spanish Republican politics, never characterized by simplicity, has become even more complicated in four years of exile. The main reason for the fragmentation of once powerful political parties and trade unions into numerically weak and ideologically sterile splinters is that none of the factions has any real program for the future. Their chief reason for existence is a desire to wield influence over the masses in Spain, once the Franco dictatorship has been ousted. Yet they all know that unity in exile is essential for the reconquest of their country.

In recent months Spanish Republican politics in exile has unquestionably taken a turn for the better. The issue of the North African political prisoners served as a first, if temporary, platform on which all political factions could unite. Soon afterwards the dissolution of the Communist International removed one of the greatest obstacles to unity. Spanish Republican politics in exile has had the tendency of all political parties, trade unions and regional groups, to split into Left and Right. The Leftists are generally willing to coöperate with the Communists. The Rightists, at least until recently, refused to do so. For this reason the dissolution of the Communist International may have a considerable effect on the question of unity in Spanish Republican ranks. The prestige of the Communist Party of Spain depends to a large extent on the conviction of many Spaniards that in view of the continued appeasement of Franco by Britain and the United States, no power except the Soviet Union is willing to support their cause. While the Communists admittedly supplied much vigorous leadership in the civil war, from the point of view of non-Communists who disliked Third International policy, the Communist Party often represented an element of disunity. The dissolution of the Comintern will remove much suspicion and hostility and facilitate the rapprochement between the Right and the Left so essential for unity.

Both the Spanish Republican Right and Left are loosely combined in two roof-organizations, products of the exile. Acción Republicana Española (ARE), led by Diego Martínez Barrio, the last President of the Republican Cortes, represents the Right. Unión Democratica Española (UDE), constituting the Left, follows the lead of Dr. Juan Negrín, the last Republican Prime Minister, now in London. Both organizations include Left and Right splinters of older political parties, such as Izquierda Republicana, Unión Republicana, Partido Socialista Obrero Español, Catalana Esquerra, Partido Nacionalista Vasco, Partido Socialista Unificado de Cataluña, and of the two great Spanish trade unions—Unión General de Trabajadores (UGT) and Confederación Nacional del Trabajo (CNT). Until recently, the ARE laid particular emphasis on the question of the constitutional continuity of Spanish Republican politics in exile in its efforts to establish a government-in-exile, while the UDE was more interested in reëstablishing an anti-fascist Popular Front which would include the Communists and the various regional groups.

Aloof from these movements of the Right and Left stands Indalecio Prieto, a Socialist and Republican War Minister, now supported by only a minority of the Spanish Socialist Party. In the early years of exile his influence depended on his control over Republican funds brought to Mexico which he administered, allegedly not quite impartially, through the Junta para Ayuda a los Refugiados Españoles (JARE). He is opposed to the plans of both Negrín and Martínez Barrio and to the idea of a government-in-exile. Such a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government, he claims, would not truly represent the Spanish people and would have no significance in international affairs.

Spanish Republican unity in exile is further impeded by the reluctance of some Basque, Catalan and Galician regionalists to enter into any agreement without previous guarantees satisfying their demand for autonomy within a potential federation of Iberian states after the collapse of the Franco dictatorship. So far their policy of the "internationalization of the national complaint" has been pursued by the Basque Government-in-Exile, headed by José Antonio de Aguirre, now in New York City; the Catalan National Council in London, presided over by Carlos Pi i Sunyer; and a number of Galician groups whose most prominent spokesman is Dr. Alfonso Castelao, a former member of the Cortes now living in Argentina.

The two most outstanding leaders in exile are Negrín and Martínez Barrio. A meeting between them, a call to unity and a satisfactory assignment of functions, should be possible. An understanding might be effected if Martínez Barrio, who lacks the personal authority necessary to direct the Free Spanish movement, would be satisfied with occupying the position of "president" in the future government-in-exile. He is legally entitled to it, as the presidency of the Republic passed to him upon the resignation of Azaña in 1939.

Juan Negrín would unquestionably be the most effective leader and Prime Minister that the Spanish Republicans could find among the exiles. His administrative energy, his combative spirit, his unwillingness to concede defeat had made him the most eminent leader of the fighting Spanish Republic, and there is no reason to believe that he has lost these qualities in exile. His readiness to deal with the Communists and regional groups on the basis of a minimum program of national unity, without surrendering to the claims of either, should make him acceptable to all except, perhaps, such intransigents as Prieto. Moreover, Negrín has one of the most brilliant minds in international politics, an invaluable asset if the Spanish Republicans intend to have any decisive influence in the councils of the United Nations, to which they rightfully belong as early fighters against fascism.

The most important and immediate function of a Free Spanish Committee or even Government-in-Exile is to impress United Nations leaders with the inescapable truth that the Spanish people have as much right to popular self-government as the people of France, Germany or Italy. Whatever success a Free Spanish Committee would have, there can be no doubt that a central authority, backed by all factions, will be more effective than will a number of groups, all claiming to speak in the name of Spanish democracy. The news of the establishment of a united committee or government-in-exile will give new encouragement to the oppressed people inside Spain and strengthen their will to resist until the day of liberation comes.

HEINZ H. F. EULAU

The Utilities' Swollen Profits

UTILITY COMPANIES of the United States are accumulating excess profits of such magnitude that a major financial scandal is probable unless speedy solution shall be made of the problem presented by such unprecedented accumulation.

Unchecked and unregulated possession of these excessive and illegal profits is general and is against the public interest. A few government agencies, the Federal Power Commission, the Security and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and two or three State Public Service Commissions have made efforts to investigate these huge profits and to turn back to consumers the overcharges but, in the main, the abuse has not been attacked by the agencies to which proper regulation has been intrusted. Instead of regulation, a movement to postpone investition until after the war emergency is under way.

Virtually all utilities share in this enormous increase of excess earnings. The Edison Electric Institute and the American Gas Association, reporting jointly for 173 utility subsidiaries of registered holding companies with combined assets of approximately $10,000,000,000, show how sudden excess wealth has come to these two groups. Commonwealth and Southern, for example, the utility formerly headed by Wendell Willkie, shows a net income for the first six months of 1943, amounting to $7,331,000 after paying all operating charges—its best showing in ten years. Consolidated Edison of New York, the utility Colossus whose bond issues overtop those of any other electric utility, shows a net income for the second quarter of 1943 amounting to $5,869,000, an increase over the record-breaking net income for the corresponding three months of last year of approximately 25 percent.

But this is only a small part of the amazing story of the excess profits that are being stored and held by the utilities. Under the guise of depreciation reserves, which means money set aside to replace outworn and obsolete equipment, utility companies had increased by 51 percent their holdings of idle funds at the end of 1941 as compared with these same reserves at the end of 1936. The increase in the five-year period amounted to $395,000,000. This showing included 85 percent of all natural-gas and electric utilities.

It is estimated that for 1943 electric-light and power companies alone will store in depreciation reserves

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than $310,000,000, against which an estimated $275,000,000 will be charged for new construction and replacements.

Bonanza days have come to the railroads and to transportation utilities generally in common with the widespread gold rush. The 1942 report by the Interstate Commerce Commission, just issued, shows that operating revenues for last year were virtually double those of 1941. The totals are $514,607,131 for 1941, as against $1,028,185,625 for 1942. After deducting operating expenses, the net income in 1942 was $958,860,655, against $501,393,076 in 1941. Both gross and net income have risen sharply in 1943.

When President Roosevelt opened his battle against inflation by creating the Office of Price Administration, he gave to that agency the power to control prices of everything entering into the cost of living—with one exception. That exception was the cost of services rendered by public utilities.

The reason for the exception, he explained, was that regulatory commissions, both federal and state, were experienced in the regulation of the income, rates and services of these utility companies and that he was entrusting them with the duty of keeping prices of these services and the income flowing from these prices below a level above which inflation would begin. In other words, he tied the costs of public services to his broad non-inflation policy, but instead of giving the OPA the power and the duty of placing ceilings over these rates, he passed this control to the utility commissions.

That trust is about to be betrayed. Most of the public utilities, as I have shown, particularly those selling to the public electric light and power, telephony, transportation and natural gas, are making profits far in excess of normal, reasonable and legal earnings. Instead of supervision and other regulatory action which is within their duty, a policy is being promoted by most regulatory agencies which will give to all utility companies the green light to keep on accumulating excess earnings without check or investigation during the war emergency and for an indefinite period thereafter.

The farmer must sell his crops below ceiling prices, merchants must sometimes sell food and commodities at prices that bring them close to bankruptcy, labor must work for fixed wages and manufacturers must operate within sharply supervised and limited earnings, but the monopolies to which federal and state governments have given extraordinary powers and have guaranteed reasonable legal profits, are to be allowed enormously increased profits with ceilings unlimited.

This amazing condition has found expression in a statement of policy adopted June 7, 1943, by the Pennsylvania Utility Commission by a vote of 3 to 1, Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan, the only remaining Democratic member, dissenting. The formal order putting this policy into effect follows:

It is imperative that public utilities maintain a strong financial position throughout the war emergency, to the end that they may render prompt and uninterrupted service during said emergency and that they may enter the post-war period prepared to promptly take up the matter of deferred maintenance and the rehabilitation of their properties.

The Commission deems it inadvisable to institute formal investigations into the reasonableness of existing rates which appear to be producing increased earnings as the result of an artificial economic situation created by war conditions.

The Commission invites the coöperation of all public utilities in refraining from the payment of dividends or owners' salaries materially higher than similar payments in peacetime, to the end that cash may be conserved to adequately meet post-war conditions; but that without such coöperation the only alternative left to the Commission is to institute an investigation into the rates, depreciation and maintenance practices and other relative affairs of any public utility showing abnormal earnings.

Every federal and state commission charged with the duty of regulating public utilities has been pondering this problem of sharply increasing utility revenue ever since the war emergency arose. In two national conventions of the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissions, which include federal and state commissioners, the problem was discussed and debated at length. Nothing was decided. A number of policies were proposed, but only tentatively. It remained for the Pennsylvania Utility Commission to come forward with a policy which is wholly satisfactory to every utility in the country: no investigation of excess earnings. No ceilings on utility profits. Trust the utilities to do the fair thing after the war emergency has passed; one rigid set of regulations for agriculture, labor, commerce and industry; another trustful, elastic, tender code for public utilities.

The combined forces of public-utility lobbyists and pro-utility state commissions completely dominated the annual convention of Federal and State Utility Commissioners which opened in Chicago September 14. No convention in the long history of the association has ever placed upon its official record such complete subservience to the demand of the utilities. Here are some of the formal actions of the convention:

1. It directed the General Counsel of the Association to present to Congress a bill which would remove from the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over rates and services of public utilities doing interstate business in all cases except those involving wholesale rates. This bill would have made impossible such investigations as those which exposed the villainies of the Hopson holding-company system and other combinations preying on the public. It is intended by this bill to curb investigations already under way by the Federal Power Commission.

2. The convention rejected by a viva-voce vote the report of the Committee on Progress in utility regulation. This report, which was presented by Commissioner Leon Jourolman of Tennessee, attacked specifically certain bad

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practices by holding companies and their subsidiaries. In the viva-voce voting, utility lobbyists participated in at least as great a number as commissioners.

3. Lobbyists were given the floor during the discussions and one of them made a bitter attack on all federal commissions except the Interstate Commerce Commission.

4. A line-up of the pro-utility forces was headed by Massachusetts, with Maine, Virginia, Arkansas and Georgia among the most vocal in the argument. Pennsylvania showed a divided delegation by a vote of four to one. California's sole representative, Kramer, voted with the reactionaries, although the California commissioners by a majority vote favored continuing the present powers of the Federal Power Commission. New Jersey's delegation, following the lead of Governor Edison, was against the reactionary trend. The Southern commissions generally followed Virginia in opposing the policies of the FPC.

The general effect of the convention was a cancellation of real utility regulation as it has been conducted by federal commissions and by progressive state commissions. The issues developed in the convention will undoubtedly be projected into next year's presidential campaign, both in the political conventions and thereafter. It will be substantially the same issue raised by Theodore Roosevelt in the Republican convention of 1912 when the trusts combined with Taft, Penrose, Barnes *et al.* to hand over to the economic policy of the nation to the oligarchs.

In the meantime, federal commissions and some state commissions are cutting into excess earnings of some big utilities through formal or informal investigations and orders. The Federal Power Commission, in the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Case and the Hope Natural Gas Case, set up a rule that the return to a wholesale natural-gas company under present conditions should not exceed 6½ percent per annum. Proceeding on that basis, the Federal Power Commission in four major rate cases forced in 1942 substantial rate reductions by the Lone Star Gas Company, the El Paso Natural Gas Company, the Northern Natural Gas Company and the United Gas Pipeline Company. It also scored a complete victory by the affirmation by the United States Supreme Court of its rate reduction in the Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America Case.

Concerning the amazing increase of excess profits by telephone companies, the issue is pointed up by the recent order of the Federal Communications Commission directing the American Telephone and Telegraph Company to make a cut of $54,000,000 in its annual revenue. Of this amount $34,000,000 is to go to reduction of rates on long-distance interstate calls and $20,000,000 will go to the Bell Companies of various states on intrastate service.

Engineers and accountants of the Pennsylvania Commission have calculated that Pennsylvania's share of this intrastate cut of $20,000,000 will be approximately $1,490,000, nearly all of which would go to Pennsylvania telephone users in the form of reduced rates. The AT and T had agreed to the reduction and the Bell Company of Pennsylvania, after conference with commission technicians, was ready for the reduction, when the majority of the commission brought all proceedings to an abrupt halt.

The reduction, said the majority, will be contrary to our newly declared policy. It is true that the Federal Communications Commission found a great volume of excess earnings and the AT and T agreed to the cut, but our policy covers all utilities. No reduction will be made in intrastate telephone rates. Commissioner Buchanan again dissented.

The general adoption of the Pennsylvania policy would result in the accumulation of huge cash reserves for "deferred maintenance" and other ostensible objectives. Claims that such reserves would not be subject to normal income and excess-profit taxes are already heard. Inasmuch as these taxes would take 85 percent of the total, segregation of the sum in a tax-free reserve would mean tax-dodging by legal subterfuge on a grand scale. Hopson, Annenburg and Al Capone went to the penitentiary because their lawyers figured a little too far over the foul line. With favorable commission policies, the utilities hope to beat the rap in their tax cases. That the proposed policy would be injurious to consumers generally and to residential consumers particularly is shown by an analysis of its language.

Proper procedure toward excess earnings would appear to be to consider each case separately upon its merits. The Federal Communications Commission did exactly that when it considered and adjudicated the enormous excess of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The Interstate Commerce Commission proceeded similarly against swollen earnings of the railroads. In that connection, Chairman Walter McDonald of the Georgia Commission recently advocated that excess earnings of the railroads be frozen and devoted to payment of their outstanding debts. This suggestion was immediately opposed by Commissioners Sachse of California, Jourolman of Tennessee and the writer, who was then a Pennsylvania commissioner.

The possible solution of the problem is increase of depreciation reserves to meet needs caused by excessive use and wartime speeds. The whole question of utility depreciation practices received extraordinary attention at the Chicago convention, when the Committee on Depreciation of Utility Property presented its long awaited formal report. The committee, whose chairman is Nelson Lee Smith, former chairman of the New Hampshire Public Service Commission and recently appointed member of the Federal Power Commission, is composed of engineers and accountants from federal and state commissions and a number of technicians representing public utilities.

Methods of computing depreciation have caused conflicting decisions in the courts for more than thirty

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years. There is hope that standards set at Chicago will bring some order out of the existing chaos.

One remedy which will give relief to consumers and will provide an equitable anti-inflation solution of the problem remains in the hands of President Roosevelt. He should remove from the state utility Commissions the power to deal with excess earnings of public utilities and should give to the Office of Price Administration the duty of setting ceilings over the income of utilities in the same manner that ceilings are set for agriculture, labor and industry generally.

RICHARD J. BEAMISH

British Labor Takes Stock

AMONG THE MORE sensational visitors at Southport, where the Trade Union Congress was held this month, were Shvernik and ten other Soviet fraternal delegates. They had come hot-foot on an important mission: to persuade the British trade-union movement to sponsor an all-out demand for a second front, in the Soviet sense, and to urge the formation of an Anglo-Soviet-American Committee, on which the CIO as well as the AFL and Railway Brotherhoods, and also the South American Federation, were to be represented. The mission failed. The congress voted favorably, but mildly, on the two Russian proposals, echoing Churchill's recommendation at the Quebec conference that a second front be opened when "the Allies have good prospects of success," and referring the suggestion for an Anglo-Soviet-American trade-union committee to the attention of the General Council "as soon as war conditions permit. . . ." In fact, mildness was the predominant tone of all the resolutions on international affairs. The congress defeated a "Vansittartite" resolution on Germany which had sought to implicate the vast majority of the German people in the war crimes committed by the Nazis, advocating instead that only those directly responsible be punished. In the reasonable but by no means startling opinion of the congress, the first duty of the international trade-union movement is to see that the trade unions in occupied countries are restored to their full freedom, and that those of enemy countries are restored "when the last vestiges of Nazidom and fascism have been obliterated and genuinely democratic regimes established."

Only in its domestic resolutions did the congress justify the impression that it had gone farther to the Left than in recent years. Resolutions were passed calling for guarantees that labor's gains would remain intact. The government was sharply criticized for doing nothing about the Beveridge Report during the nine months since its publication, and the attempt of the insurance companies to sabotage the report was roundly condemned. A note of irritation with vague, high-sounding policies was evident in a resolution propounding four decencies that put the four freedoms on which they are based into clearer and more concrete context: a decent job, a decent home, decent education and decent social insurance.

As in the sphere of governments, so in that of working-class organizations, Britain has an intermediate if not mediating vote between her two great allies. This year's congress had to consider and debate upon the report of Sir Walter Citrine's journeys to the USA and the USSR. Like Churchill, Sir Walter (since 1926 General Secretary to the TUC) has been impelled to travel both east and west. But it is generally felt that Sir Walter has not been sufficiently anxious to obtain a solid allied front of trade unionists. Even his closest supporters in Transport House are doubtful whether his journeys may not have done more harm than good. There is widespread criticism of his intervention, supposedly to bring the AFL and CIO together into the inter-allied committee, but actually leaving the situation between the two bodies worse than he found it. This is read by critics as a deliberate disinclination to face the implications for British trade unionism of a committee unduly weighted in a leftward direction. Citrine is a man of distinguished ability, under whose guidance the British movement has gained prestige and political influence. This influence has been used conservatively but constructively. One may suppose that Citrine is anxious about the left-flowing tide and its tendency to wash away his patient constructions.

The Three Power Problem, as manifested at Southport, is the problem of three conservatisms. There is the obstinate right-wing conservatism of the AFL, accepting private enterprise, hostile to the USSR. There is the obstinate left-wing conservatism of the Russians, ready to accept anything if it will help the USSR. And there is the obstinate conservatism of the British Trade Unions' General Council, bent on a middle-way solution and opposed to anything either of Left or Right which makes it less probable or plausible. The three have at first sight little in common except their obstinacy; and yet their clients are the same organized industrial workers. The sympathy of the latter for the cause of the Soviet Union, at this stage of the war, is unmistakably strong in Britain and, we are given to understand, in America, at least so far as the CIO is concerned. The desire to help Russia, to end the war quickly and to benefit from victory constructively is so strong that the three conservatisms are forced to impinge upon one another. The great majority of the 750 British trade-union delegates want

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a synthesis and are pushing their middle-way-minded General Council in that direction. The General Council has a highly developed technique for shelving awkward issues, which they use with masterly skill: they cannot, after all, risk accepting the Russian conservatism as a legitimate counterpart of their own. To do so, they argue, would be to abdicate their own power and their own constructive efforts.

The end of the last war saw the setting up of the General Council; this body has no constitutional power over the separate unions, but it has built up an actual power for guidance and direction of the labor movement as a whole. In this war, it has enmeshed itself in the complex machinery of wartime controls. Citrine at Transport House, no less than Bevin at the Ministry of Labor, is a part of the war machine. This war is a war between industrial nations and a war between industrial workers. Which workers will work hardest? Which will stand up to bombing best? Which will put up with the prolonged grind of war for that extra spell of effort which can bring victory? Which workers have a horizon over which they believe a genuine sun will rise? In the answers to these questions lie the winning or losing of this as of all modern wars. Hence the military significance of trade unions. It was already clear in the last war. Its perception led, in one sense, to the Fascist and Nazi alternative form of industrial organization. This war has been a test of the relative staying power of different types of working-class organizations.

The great staying power of the Russians has impressed all sections of British opinion in a way which is not perhaps paralleled in America on the same broad scale. The enthusiasm of British conservative and military persons for Russian arms has sometimes to be heard to be believed. It springs no doubt from an ever present sense of where all of us would be but for the Russians. It has been expressed publicly and privately, by Churchill, as one of those big axioms which he shares with Left and Right alike. But naturally it is most deeply felt among the working-class rank and file who can most readily identify themselves with the achievements of their Russian comrades. Here is a force—their force—unchained and used to the full for the first time. Russian victories are victories for a worker state, and workers everywhere feel their spirits raised, their prestige enhanced, as a result. Managements cash in on the feeling, and invite them to "think of Moscow" and work a harder shift. The postponement of the second front has helped to keep the Russians in a superior moral position, ourselves inferior.

The Trade Union Congress has become, in the past twenty years, an accepted part of British democracy. It is complementary to Parliament, an extra outlet and means of expression. The war, with its high premium on industrial effort, has emphasized this. The Trade Union Congress, dominated by the General Council, is also a slow-moving, even sluggish assembly. The system of bloc voting, the reference back to committees, the diversity and autonomy of the separate unions are all factors making for conservatism and caution. As in other federal organizations, the pace is that of the slowest members. So it is unwise to prophesy spectacular new developments. Yet the signs are that, just as the last war brought national cohesion to the movement for the first time, so this war may see the first steps toward international cohesion. Along with the fear of post-war unemployment (a potent political factor) goes the recognition that it can only be abated on international lines. If the General Council fails to bring together the trade-union movements of the three powers as a whole, there are already comings and goings at other levels. The Transport Workers, the Metal Workers and others are seeking to get their Internationals into shape, with British unions taking the initiative. The continued functioning of the ILO is also of significance in this connection.

Then there is the problem of Germany. A "Vansittartite" resolution was killed at Southport. A new aspect of this controversy was suggested by Ernest Bevin, in a speech to the congress, where he spoke, as a visitor, on behalf of the government. Who could deny to the Russians, he asked, the right to the restoration of their ravaged country? He seems to have implied, not so much financial reparation of the kind which was so disastrous last time, but reconstruction by German labor and with German tools of the areas devastated by Hitler's army. A liberal note was struck, in the presidential address, by the first woman president, Ann Loughlin, who pleaded for "justice, but not revenge."

It is an interesting reflection that the degree of collaboration which is possible among the United Nations may be conditioned by their varying degrees of development in labor organization. Britain has the great advantage of the united trade-union movement, whose unity has survived the stresses of evolution from craft unionism to the industrial and general unionism required by modern industrial and technical progress. But Britain has, in contrast with Russia, a great tripartite division among workers, employers and the state. The two former, in their organizations, are still working toward a greater centralization of control over the productive system; but neither really expects at the present stage to get unique control for himself. The suggestion in some quarters that they may enter into a partnership of producers, at the expense of the consumer, is probably a misunderstanding. So is the theory launched by Burnham, which has gained a good deal of currency here, that the managerial group is about to take over. These are all tendencies, none of them absolute. In practice, there is evolving in Britain another stage in the balance of internal power. At this stage, the trade unions are emerging in many respects stronger than they have ever been before.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was the general impression that the Southport congress was farther to the Left than recent congresses. This is a natural result of the expectation that the war will end soon and of the Russian achievements leading to this expectation. The congress produced evidence of a growing resistance within the other trade unions to excessive domination by the two great general unions. These, the Transport and General Workers and the General and Municipal Workers, have a joint membership of about 2,000,000. They have great influence in the General Council, and this influence is used largely for shelving and delaying operations. They were outvoted on progressive issues, which they had recommended for reference back to the General Council. This was probably because the resolutions concerned could have compelled Bevin (who still has a delegate's seat at the congress, as a member of the T and GWU) to take action as Minister of Labor, and action which might be particularly provoking to the employers. For example, one resolution asked for compulsory recognition of trade-union agreements in concerns where there is a substantial proportion of trade unionists. The demand was largely sponsored by the white-collar and technicians' unions, which are a factor of rising prominence in the movement. The groups which Burnham sees as taking over control in the near future are in this country flocking into the unions. The importance attached by the congress to education and to raising the school-leaving age is another sign that the unions are contemplating a future in which brain work is of key importance in any system of control. But there are no indications that they are preparing to hand over to a generation of bureaucrats.

Southport, England CHARLES MADGE

The Abolition of the Plow

LIKE FINE WINE, fast automobiles and cussin' words, the old moldboard or turning plow is something that serves us best when used with moderation. But it takes a strong man to resist the temptation to excess, and an experienced man to see the wisdom of discriminate use.

For the past two hundred years, more or less, we in the United States have been on something that might be called a moldboard-plow jag. Young and healthy, with plenty of land, we were able to take it year in and year out for a long time, returning to our farm labors each spring with little more than a mild hangover. Ultimately, however, excesses reach a climax. There comes a time when the hangover begins to resemble an unhappy delirium. Some twenty years ago we went out with turning plows on a particularly lavish spree, and awoke to find ourselves in a delirium of monstrous dust storms and yawning gullies. That was when we really began to learn from experience and see the handwriting on the wall of time.

Now I don't mean to condemn the turning plow out of hand. It is a handy and serviceable instrument. It ought to continue as an honorable servant of mankind for generations to come, but there's a time and place for everything. Turning soil upside down—which has been one of the main functions of this plow—is not generally one of the wisest steps in agriculture, although we've been indulging in it for well over a century. It puts the vegetative material, including grain stubble, corn stalks, grass and legumes, as well as weeds, anywhere from six to twelve inches underground, and turns fresh loose earth to the top.

When the grass and other vegetative litter is lodged a foot underground, it can't protect the surface. And fresh, loose soil exposed to the sun, wind and rain on top of a field is a rank invitation to trouble. The sun bakes the life out of the unprotected soil, at least temporarily. When it is good and dry, the wind can blow it away. And when any kind of rainfall heavier than a drizzle hits it, you get soil washing—sheet erosion and gullies—and an aftermath of muddy rivers and silt in reservoirs and harbors. Also, if the land happens to be sloping—and about 90 percent of the cropland of the United States slopes enough to erode readily—you may get such a rush of water and soil downhill that crops go along with it. It is only adding insult to injury, of course, to realize that the downhill wash of water and topsoil also carries away with it the fertilizers and natural plant food in the soil that crops must have in order to thrive.

In his recent book, "Plowman's Folly,"[1] E. H. Faulkner produces an assortment of evidence on the evils of the turning plow. As counsel for the prosecution, he has plenty of ammunition to work with, to be sure. The indictment could run to many pages.

But I wouldn't want to argue for complete and instantaneous prohibition in this case. A small island of usefulness remains for the moldboard plow. Throughout the country, technicians of the Soil Conservation Service and other agricultural experts are striving to develop as rapidly as possible the new methods and machinery precisely adaptable to the erosion control and production needs of each varying agricultural locality. This work is steadily taking the form of a new agriculture in our country, an agriculture based on soil-conservation farming methods. And to date our progress with it is pacing the rest of the world. Under this soil-conservation agriculture, it seems probable that the

[1] Plowman's Folly, by E. H. Faulkner. University of Oklahoma Press. 161 pages. $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old turning plow will be outmoded for general use in ordinary farm-tillage operations. If three-fourths of the cropland of the country never again felt the bite of the turning plow for ordinary farm tillage, it would be a gain to rural America.

But there will still be a place for the historic implement. We shall still need it, and employ it gainfully, in building field terraces—those earthen ridges which need to be plowed across slopes, on the level, to intercept the run-off of rainfall. We shall need it in plowing certain necessary contour furrows, and for ditching, too. We may still want to use it on some of our truly level land—although there is far less of this kind of land than most people believe—as a help in the intensive production of truck crops. And there may be other uses.

Across the vast expanse of America's cropland, however, we are in need of a new type of plow. This is not heresy. Is it so fantastic to expect that the agricultural operation of plowing should progress by refinement, just as refrigeration, the automobile, lighting and the airplane have progressed? Already many new-type plows are in the field to replace the old turning plow. More than twenty were introduced in a recent single year. Some are proving more satisfactory than others, but all have a common aim: to break up compacted soil, kill weeds, and at the same time leave protective crop residues on the surface of the land.

Some of the new plows run along a few inches beneath the surface of the ground. Others have the effect of slicing through. And there are all manner of variations in between. Farmers already are beginning to adopt the new system. In some localities, where only a few years ago 95 percent of the farmers burned off their wheat stubble every year so as to make it easier to plow for the following year's crop, nearly all the growers are now using plows that leave a considerable part of the stubble on the surface. They have stopped burning and are finding that the wheat-stubble litter, or straw scattered over the field, has a powerful effect, not only in increasing yields but in preventing soil from washing and blowing. This new system is sometimes referred to as "subsurface tillage." Some call it "trashy fallow," and many of us are hoping that it will eventually be referred to as the "stubble-mulch" method. The new method will not be a cure-all, of course, but it is proving to be a most efficient tool in an ever increasing number of farming areas.

The soil-and-water-conservation experiment stations of the Soil Conservation Service at Statesville, North Carolina, and Lincoln, Nebraska, have proved by precise measurements that when vegetative litter is maintained on the surface there is much less loss of soil and water than when the ground is left bare. Forty years ago I learned, along with many another soil surveyor, that in sampling soil in dry periods it was much easier to bore a hole in the ground with the soil auger in those places having an accumulation of leaves, straw or other vegetative litter on the surface, than where there was no such covering. The explanation was simple: there was more moisture under the litter, either because evaporation had been reduced or because plants were not pumping the soil dry in their struggle for the moisture necessary for survival.

By personal observation, by the results of scientific study and by the practical experience of farmers, I believe it is becoming increasingly evident that the passing of the turning plow from general use in field cultivation would be a boon. Some day it may be regarded as a notable event in history. H. H. BENNETT

Labor's Post-War Plans

ORGANIZED LABOR intends to have a seat at the peace table. From all parts of the labor movement plans and programs, resolutions and speeches, are pouring in to swell this demand. The volume is beginning to be impressive, but overworked union leaders are sharply aware of the head start that industry already has in post-war planning.

Several unions from both the AFL and the CIO have already brought out extensive post-war programs in the names of their individual organizations. Of these programs, one group tackles labor's post-war problems as a part of the total problem facing all sections of our world. The plans of the United Auto Workers (CIO), the Textile Workers' Union (CIO), and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) are examples of this kind of approach. All of these call for full United States participation in a post-war world organization to preserve the peace, with an international police force to do its will, and for continuing responsibility on the part of the United States for relief and rehabilitation and an improved standard of living for all people everywhere. Each of these plans makes specific proposals for at least some phases of the demobilization and reconversion problems with which we shall be faced in this country immediately after the war ends, recommending separation bonuses and continued pay for servicemen until reëmployment, guaranteed jobs or educational opportunity for veterans and various kinds of protection for war workers who will also face dislocation (the details vary).

The plans go on to longer-range proposals for attaining full production and full employment, urging the fullest development through private enterprise but also the fullest development of government plans for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bridging gaps between private job opportunities and full employment, with programs for housing, conservation of natural resources, power development, highways and schools, recreation and health facilities. None of these labor plans, significantly, is without a sympathetic and enlightened plank on farm production. The terms of the social-security portions of each of the plans are almost identical, since pending legislation supported by labor is now involved; they urge federal aid to education and extensions and revisions in the social-security system in line with the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. And they agree that all this must be supported under a tax system based on ability to pay, with such methods as sales taxes ruled out.

The UAW plan, launched two months ago, talks only in a rather general way about labor's role in the execution of post-war programs at home, saying simply that "organized labor must be given full representation and responsibility at all levels." More recently CIO ideas on this subject have apparently been coming into sharper focus. Recent speeches by various CIO leaders and the resolutions of the last CIO Executive Board meeting emphasize the need for a new government coördinating agency to gather the facts pertaining to reconversion and demobilization, analyze them and obtain proper action, perhaps through encouraging the development of industry councils for each of our major industries, the councils to be composed in every case of labor, management and government representatives. From the AFL side has now come the proposal that the government immediately create "a single Reconversion Agency on which labor and management are fully represented, which could guide and assist the nation in its task of reconversion. . . . Such an agency would serve to unify several major tasks intimately related to each other: termination of war contracts, disposal of war inventories and surplus materials to assure stability of prices and of markets, reconversion of production facilities and demobilization of fighters and workers and their transfer to stable employment."

All of labor's post-war suggestions seem to start from the premise that abolition of the National Resources Planning Board, which labor opposed, was an error that must be corrected by creation of some new group to fill the gap.

The National Maritime Union adopted a plan at its convention recently which reaffirms the broad, general policies contained in the other plans mentioned above, but devotes most of its space to the future of the American merchant marine, maritime laws, veterans' benefits for merchant seamen, living conditions on ships, rest homes and kindred issues. The Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL) has analyzed possibilities in some fifteen basic activities in the building-construction field which will have a direct effect on the post-war electrical-construction industry, as a supplement to the more far-reaching proposals discussed above. And the usually slow-moving and not very revolutionary Building Trades Department of the AFL surprised everyone almost a full year ago by coming up with an exceptionally thorough survey of the future of television as it relates to jobs for building-trades workers.

The AFL Electrical Workers, under the leadership of Marion Hedges, have entered into an as yet unique labor-management-committee arrangement for post-war planning. The National Electrical Contractors' Association is a joint member with the IBEW of the Labor-Management Planning Committee for the electrical-construction industry. The committee's first preliminary report, which was issued in June, claims that "the association and the union have taken the greatest forward step in the history of the industry, and probably the most advanced step of any industrial group in America, by deciding to work out their problems together." There is some indication that AFL leadership is thinking in terms of extending the electrical-industry plan more widely. It differs at present from the CIO Industry Council idea in that government is not a party, although the plan does recommend close contact with government agencies.

The AFL has established more post-war-planning machinery to date than has the CIO. It has functioning subcommittees on such major questions as housing, transportation and social security, and has gone farther on surveying industrial trends. The CIO Research Division is now holding a series of meetings of the international research directors to lay the groundwork for post-war consideration at the CIO convention, which should stimulate more planning and action by individual unions.

But it is almost certain that the main CIO force will now be directed toward forcing the government to assume its rightful responsibility for directing our national plans for peace. At its last meeting, the CIO Executive Board put its finger on the vital spots of our post-war policy:

> In rebuilding its economy on a peacetime basis, the nation should seek not merely avoidance of disaster but the achievement of positive goals which our productive resources now make possible. . . . The kind of world we shall have five years from now is being shaped today by inaction as well as by conscious intent. . . . Only the federal government can act for the nation as a whole and can effectively control economic forces that ignore state lines.

More of labor's energies than have yet been put into post-war activities can be invested there with profit. Knowledge that labor is planning and working for security and work for all can be a great driving stimulus to workers in the immediate job of winning the war. American labor can serve all the world by making certain that our post-war plans apply the lessons we have learned from this war at such great price.

Washington HELEN FULLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Varied Matters

CONGRESS REASSEMBLED Tuesday, September 14, and on the same day the McCormick-Patterson press went into eruption and has been spouting lava and journalistic ashes ever since. It is one of the most extraordinary barrages seen in a long time. Here are items culled from The Washington Times-Herald, local outlet for The Chicago Tribune and The New York Daily News:

On September 14, John O'Donnell, author of the earlier story about the Wacs' alleged immorality, greeted returning congressmen with another beauty; the sensational charge that Canada is disbanding "combat divisions" at a time when the United States "proposes to draft fathers." This was a distortion of Canada's reorganization of home-guard troops following removal of direct invasion fears.

From then to Sunday there were front-page stories of Canadian demobilization and pieces on General MacArthur and Martin Dies, with supporting cartoons and features on the editorial pages.

On Sunday, readers got two "plots" for their dime; the Churchill-Roosevelt "plot" to oust General Marshall because, as it was explained, he refused to "melt down" the army "into some global police force designed to bolster the British Empire"; and plot 2, that Rhodes Scholars, seeking to bring the United States "back into the British Empire," are taking over the government.

Next day: More anti-Marshall plot.

September 21: Walter Trohan, imaginative Tribune writer, charged that the British were also out plotting against Admiral Leahy and General MacArthur.

September 22: Eight-column banner—"MacArthur Flays Pacific War Strategy."

September 23: Eight-column banner—"MacArthur in Surprise Blow at Jap Base."

September 24: Trohan piece charging the New Deal with seeking to remove Marshall, in order to create a "global WPA program."

September 25: Trohan piece, with anti-Semitic flavor, charging that the New Deal, led by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, is plotting to fire five major generals, cited by name, and to replace them with non-military radicals, including "Dr. Eli Ginsburg," with the object of winning "a fourth term through a global WPA program."

Last week I heard General Marshall himself testify before the joint congressional committees on the Wheeler father-draft bill. I had never seen him in action before. He is one of the most effective witnesses I ever followed. His testimony killed the bill. There were no false notes in his testimony, no mugging and gagging, nor the mawkish kind of deference and deprecation that so frequently go with a congressional hearing. Because he set a forthright tone, the members of the committee followed along on the same level, too. He is not the military glamor type, like General MacArthur, and he is somewhat more articulate and practised than General Eisenhower, able though the latter is. I don't know what his ideological convictions are (if any) and this may be a belated discovery on my part, but I think we have something pretty good in George Marshall. General Marshall outlined the military situation in a nutshell: we have landed a heavyweight punch on the German jaw, he said, and the big thing now is to keep hitting without a moment's let up. The greatest economy in dollars and human lives will be to keep the blows coming now at all costs; the German military is off-balance and the great thing is to keep it there. This implies taking long-range chances. The attack on Salerno was such a chance, General Marshall said. In the awful business of weighing battle chances, it was felt that the expenditure of brave young lives there, even in a touch-and-go venture, would be a long-run economy. This was true even if the venture failed. And it didn't fail.

Looking at Congress one constantly wonders how strong this national will is. The Fulbright resolution for post-war coöperation passed the House last week 360 to 29, but it was too general in character to be much of a test. Those who voted against it would seemingly also have voted against the Ten Commandments. Yet even so, many congressmen confided to reporters that they secretly opposed the bill, and were only approving it because it didn't mean anything and the Senate would kill it anyway. The Mackinac Island resolution, the Fulbright resolution, the Legion resolution are all hopeful steps in an educational process, but here at the Capital we know that the real test will come in that far-off day when the peace treaty is finally submitted to the Senate, with all the hounds of the McCormick-Patterson kennels probably howling in unison, and the Constitution giving the isolationists the tremendous two-thirds'-vote advantage that killed the League of Nations, a veto power over the majority by one-third plus one.

The conservative organ of the Commerce Department, Survey of Current Business, in the September issue, out last week, has just published the estimated profits, after taxes, of America's corporations up to and through the half-year of 1943. These reveal in official and formal statistics perhaps the single most remarkable economic feature of World War II: that American business is not only making a profit out of the war, but an unprecedented profit. The profits for this year, after taxes, are now expected to reach $8,400,000,000, as against the previous all-time high of $7,900,000,000 in the 1929 bonanza. It should be stressed that these profits are estimated after deducting the existing normal taxes, war taxes, and also making allowances for reduced profits due to the renegotiation law, which the corporation lobby is even now denouncing in congressional hearings as too severe.

The same government publication notes that the "advertising-activity index reaches new high." Jesse Jones's publication, wisely enough, does not editorialize on this remarkable fact, which of course represents income-tax evasion. But it does note that a "record volume of advertising is now being directed at retail consumers, in spite of increasing shortages in consumer goods."

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Exterior Decorating

"HOLY MATRIMONY" is a typical job of carpentering by the producer-writer, Nunnally Johnson, who takes rather mediocre, clumsy frameworks and reworks them into adequate movies, which look nice, function well and stop just short of significant movie expression. The virtues of a Johnson-hammered film arise from a considerable talent for surface effects, which includes using extra players to advantage, an awareness and control of the environment so that it can be made either realistic or satirical, and a facility with dialogue. His productions are graced with a raft of experts like Alan Mowbray, Melville Cooper and Eric Blore. The ailments in the original scores of such things as "The Moon Is Down," "Life Begins at 8:30" and this one, are still in after Mr. Johnson finishes with them, but they are not so noticeable.

"Holy Matrimony" is a pleasant, gray-haired comedy, which Arnold Bennett first thought up in 1905, about an English painter who palmed off his dead valet as himself so he could live quietly and unknown in London. Later he is found out on the strength of two moles he has on his left collar-bone—the papers scream "Shame! Painter not in Valhalla!" and one carries the headline "American Claims Record—105 Moles." The painter has a tendency to confuse his assumed name of Henry Wadsworth Leek with Henry Greenleaf Leek. The picture seems to be spoofing Paul Gauguin, since in this case an English painter leaves his palmy Tahitian paradise for a quiet married life in the heart of the London suburbs with a practical, middle-aged matron. Mr. Monty Woolley plays the painter; he is still an inert performer covered by a beard, with an irascible voice that snaps the ends of his sentences off in a cold fury, even when he is conversing contentedly. Miss Gracie Fields plays his wife with much more talent. She has a good face and a good voice for movies, and only rarely does the professional impersonator show through her performance.

For a movie based on such an incredible occurrence as this one is, it is the most lethargic and restrained of comedies, which gets by on meager helpings of understated humor and quiet life, for which elderly people will go quietly crazy. It is no doubt Twentieth Century-Fox's intention, now that they have helped lower the age of the most frequent movie-goers to 18 with Betty Grable and Flicka, to try to lift it to 58 with Woolley and Fields.

In "Holy Matrimony" the laughs are always the result of commendable secondary effects brushed over situations which are unrealized, anemic and often vague. In the Westminster Abbey episode the diversion is in the interest of the ceremony and spectacle of Abbey burying. The hat-fitting episode has a brief, beautiful parody of the way a hatter swipes the felt smooth, and then, after clamping the hat on his customer's head, intimidates him into liking it. One of the finer episodes has the dead valet's first wife showing up to claim Mr. Woolley, who is now living in middle-aged seclusion and paradise with Miss Fields. The scene produces nothing that is new or remarkable: the artist, who has never seen the woman, is horrified; his practical wife gets him out of the way and then convinces the other woman that Mr. Woolley is crazy, a pauper, and will bring disgrace on her and her three sons. The scene's humor is in the spinsterish dress and posing of the family—middle-class and puritan in their coal-black Sunday best, except for a third son, who hulks sourly in the background, looking like a woodchopper in his working clothes, clearly the bastard son.

There are many scenes that make you feel the thing wasn't grasped too well. Mr. Woolley's breaking down and crying at his funeral seems odd, because till then he had seemed to understand his part as requiring no emotion; his refusal to admit his identity at the end is as unconvincing as was his urge to admit it earlier in the picture. It is never clear just what personality Mr. Woolley is going to try to be; he is a three-way light connection which the plot and director switch as they see fit. Nevertheless, the film is sufficiently sprinkled with laughs, like a papier-maché sundae with real nuts. Also, it is the first American movie to show paintings that were executed by a painter rather than a sign painter. Mr. Woolley's art—Eakins-like paintings of non-surgical or non-rowing scenes—could very well be considered quite good by all the people who so considered them.

MANNY FARBER

Brood of Glory

Land of Fame, by Albert and Mary Bein, based on the story by Charles Paver and Mr. Bein. Belasco Theatre, September 21, 1943.

ALL THOUGH THE PERFORMANCE of "Land of Fame," the new play about the war in Greece, I found myself thinking of Spenser's lines, where he says the noble heart that harbors virtuous thought, and is with child of glorious great intent, can never rest until it forth have brought the eternal brood of glory excellent. For this play is one of those efforts in the theatre that the sincere and truly loyal critic must be careful about. It represents one of those cases where the man's reach does indeed exceed his grasp, and where the divine wonder he feels and his desire for action are checked by circumstance and the degree of his talent. In the production and writing of plays there are two extreme ends. One, perfectly legitimate and highly professional, is to please, and to put the venture over. The other is to get said what is to be said and to win the audience to it. Between these two stools quite serious and reputable theatre efforts very often flounder and are lost.

"Land of Fame" does get lost finally and misses the attention that its material and its intention deserve. Even the structure of its many scenes, those at the very last excepted, gets along well enough but fails to pull it through. The occasion remains, nevertheless, one to be respected. In its use of material, of locale and of music to establish the scenes, their beginning and end, it manifested an aim our theatre sorely needs, by which I mean passionate content and elevation. I have great respect for this new war play and its intentions. (Nor do I compare it as some reviewers will no doubt do, to "The Moon Is Down," which many of them helped to kill, and which erred, where it erred, by relying too much on the novel from which it was drawn.) The virtues of this new play are real, its impulse noble; but its faults are even more real—they are mostly theatrical nonsense designed to click, and the character of its impulse too often degenerates by missing fire.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The story of "Land of Fame" is a moving one of the invasion of Greece and the Nazi efforts to reduce a little town to all that is rotten and defeated. Peter Melinas, the guerrilla leader, and Angela, the girl he loves, are the central figures, plus the Nazi officials, the villagers and the guerrilla patriots. We pass finally from epic struggle into what, for lack of depth, is only melodrama. The end of this story is shall we say snipped off at a more agreeable moment than most plays about Nazi invasions have been: we actually see some of the foul dramatic fiends dramatically shot. In every war we have the two aspects: one is the kings and great commanders who must seem to direct and rule, but the wonder of the war is the people. The authors of this play about the war in Greece and the splendor of the Greek resistance have not the creative power to give us their people richly, though they have an inkling of this rugged fact.

The characters are not developed with any warm blood or precision of outline, but such as they are, the company for "Land of Fame" play with competence and sincerity, however much or little we may be convinced thereby. The lines of the dialogue, the speeches, are all too often not good theatre, not good literature, not even good recorded photography. But Mr. Whitford Kane as the wagon-maker of Mandra—most of which role amounts to just about those words and nothing more tangible for the actor—plays with his usual competence. Mr. Stefan Schnabel plays well enough in what is almost a truly significant part, that of the Gestapo lieutenant who sickens at the Nazi theories in action. Mr. Kenneth Le Roy, despite a poor diction or accent, is in both mask and rhythm unusually convincing as the Greek shepherd boy. Mr. Norman Rose, as the guerrilla leader and Angela's lover, is a good choice for the part. He could get a better English to accompany such a fine stage voice, but his main setback is the lack of proper lines to speak—there was never an actor on any stage who could cope with some he has to say. Miss Beatrice Straight brings to the role of the girl whom the rebel leader loves a sincere dramatic impulse and true performance, an unusual movement, much needed on our stage just now, a telling beauty and a living, good English. Fine as her quality and talent are, she is repeatedly balked by speeches that nobody could say and by clumsy dramatic uncertainties in the development of the scenes.

Whatever may be the thoughts of serious spectators with regard to the arts, the fact evidently remains that art is long and life is short. The basic trouble with "Land of Fame" is something that could never be explained to its authors—else they could never have left the lines as they are, the banal writing we must hear, the impossible clichés the actors are dosed with—or to any members of its audiences that failed to see what the trouble essentially was all along. The trouble with the obvious is that it tends to be obvious only to those it is obvious to. There is little else to be said on that point. If you can write many of the lines in "Land of Fame" as we now hear it, you will not—for the time being at least—understand anything said against their banality, their false literariness, their lack of practical theatricality and their deficiency in taste and tone, and so your case might seem to be hopeless.

To be or not to be theatre is a great question and challenge. We can say of "Land of Fame" that it is thrilling and genuine as compared, for example, to Mr. Maxwell Anderson's "Candle in the Wind"—a doubtful compliment but for some readers suggestive—and that it represents a fine intention, by no means so dull as might be thought, in our theatre.

STARK YOUNG

A Communication

East Prussia and the Jews

SIR: The experiment of separating East Prussia from the rest of Germany by the Polish corridor has proved disastrous, and we are all aware that some different solution must be found by the victorious Allies at the close of the present war. Yet Poland would again have the right to a corridor to the sea through territory prevailingly Polish; the Germans would have the undeniable right to a corridor across the corridor; and we know now that this attempted adjustment of conflicting rights with its crisscross of corridors cannot be made a permanent and workable arrangement. To make of East Prussia an independent German state would be open to the same objections.

Some of the Allied statesmen who have realized that the separation of Germans from Germans by a Polish corridor must not by any means be tried again are now considering the idea of giving East Prussia to Poland, and the Poles have recently made a claim to this effect. In view of Germany's treatment of them, there would be poetic justice in this. It would be a punishment none too severe for Germany's crimes. If the whole German population of East Prussia, some two and a quarter millions, were transported to the rest of Germany, Hitler, who has gone in for the transporting of whole populations, could scarcely claim that this was a cruel and unusual form of punishment. East Prussia is a thriving land, excelling in agriculture, and Poland would be richly rewarded for her sufferings.

But the Jews have been as barbarously treated as the Poles—more barbarously if that is possible—and they have need, a much greater need than the Poles', of this excellent stretch of territory. For they could make of it a home land, and a refuge from their persecutors. As we long have realized, the Jews should be not a people but a nation, with representation at the council table. To give them at long last a home land and a national existence would be to right an injury ages upon ages old.

The first objection that will occur to anyone is obvious. Though not creating another Alsace-Lorraine, as we would by giving East Prussia to Poland, would we not plant an incentive to another war? Would Germany ever accept the arrangement as final? Or would "New Judea" (to call it so for convenience) became a buffer state between Germany and Russia, with all the difficulties and dangers that the inhabitants of buffer states know too well? Would the giving of good German soil to the hated Jews arouse even a deeper resentment than giving it to Poland, with a furious determination to retake their land when the first opportunity arose?

At first blush it would seem so; but I ask for the longer view, for a consideration of the final outcome. For the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present, at least, the danger would not exist. We are to have a disarmed Germany and (pray God and the Allied leaders!) an international protection against aggression for many years to come. The question is whether, when Germany's good behavior has led us to relax our vigilance and she has grown powerful again, the little state of "New Judea" beyond the corridor would appeal to the new generation of Germans as a cause for waging war, or as a reminder that the world will not again tolerate the furies of barbarism in a supposedly civilized state.

There are reasons for believing that the new Germany will be a sadder but a wiser state than the Germany which exulted in Hitler. There would be nothing to fear or pretend to fear in the little Jewish state. To conquer it would be to bring back within the confines of Germany the hordes of Jews they say they do not want. Hitler claimed that the Jews in Germany became a menace by attempting, with international ramifications, to get themselves in control; but with the Jews living in a nation of their own this excuse for sadistic cruelty would not exist. Long before the time when Germany would be able to reassert her dominion, the little state would have its well established place in European geography; it would have proved itself an asset, commercially and economically, to all the surrounding countries. Moreover, these Germans would know that Russia would not tolerate a conquest that brought Germany almost (or quite) to her boundaries. There would be reasons enough and to spare to persuade Germany to leave the little Jewish state alone. So the plan seems both good statecraft and good business.

The Jews themselves may at first look askance at my suggestion. Those whose religious and nationalistic feelings are centered in Palestine might think of "New Judea" as a dangerous diversion. But the present plan has no connection with the Zionist movement. There is no more reason why the Jews should be limited to one state than why the Arabs should. The Jews in Europe have become Europeanized; they could not go *en masse* to Palestine, even if there were adequate accommodation for them there. They are already in great numbers in the countries surrounding East Prussia, and here they could establish a nation which would serve as a guardian to all the Jews in Europe.

There are on the other hand many American Jews who are absorptionists, who wish to obliterate all distinction between Jew and Gentile, and some of these might think that the establishment of "New Judea" would emphasize their apartness. It could have no such result. Our Irish citizens were not made more conspicuously Irish by the establishment of the Free State. Of course my plan would not interfere with contented American Jews, or suggest that any Jew should go anywhere against his wishes. It is only the persecuted European Jews who are concerned.

The suggestion has been made to me that it might be better to have the Jews a mandated people under protection of the Allied Nations. I do not agree. The Jews are not a backward people; they are entirely capable of self-government. And the very existence of a strong and independent nation of Jews would, I think, do much to put the Jew on equal footing with the representatives of other nations.

In support of my thesis I quote from Leo Pinsker's "Auto-Emancipation":

> National self-respect! Where can we find it? It is precisely the great misfortune of our race that we do not constitute a nation but are merely Jews. . . . Grant us but our independence, give us but a little strip of land like that of the Serbians and Rumanians, give us a chance to lead a national existence and then prate about our lacking manly virtues! If we would have a secure home, give up our endless life of wandering and rise to the dignity of a nation in our own eyes and in the eyes of the world, we must, above all, not dream of restoring ancient Judea. . . . Perhaps the Holy Land will again become ours. If so, all the better; but *first of all*, we must determine—and this is the crucial point—what country is accessible to us.

Another such place as East Prussia, and another such opportunity to do the Jews justice by an act of just retribution upon their persecutors would be hard to find. Most of us were little concerned about the Jew and his troubles until the Hitler persecutions shocked us into becoming their advocates; but now we are determined that a helpless people shall not again be made to suffer unspeakable horrors from the scourging of a devil and his cohorts. The humanitarian motive does not often determine the course of statecraft, but when we find it on the side of policy and profit its voice may be eloquent in our ears!

Stanford University, Calif. HENRY DAVID GRAY

The Bandwagon

Col. William T. Colman, formerly the commander of this army air base [Selfridge Field, Michigan], was found guilty today by a court-martial of the shooting "through carelessness" of a Negro private at the post. As punishment Colman was ordered reduced from his temporary rank of colonel to captain. . . . On the more serious charge of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman the court found Colman not guilty. Had he been convicted of this count, his discharge from the service would have been the penalty.—*From The Chicago Sun.*

Perhaps [Harry] Hopkins' very friendliness towards the Russians led him to say more politely what our military experts have been saying more bluntly. We don't need the Russians to lick Hitler, and the contrary argument isn't buying Stalin a damn thing. The Russians can help us do the job faster . . . and we are willing to buy that—but not if the price is too high.—*From "Capital Comment," by Jonathan Stout, in The New Leader.*

Brave New World

If necessity is the mother of invention, then want is the mother of necessity. Freedom from want would stall progress. So private initiative would dry up and the spirit of progress would disappear. . . . All of the good in this world came from want and now our planners want to give us freedom from want.—*From an editorial in The Brady, Texas, Standard.*

Total-Peace Department

A California citizen, anticipating a shortage of men after the war, proposed nationwide polygamy to give every woman a husband. This also would get the women out of the factories so that soldiers can find jobs, he said.—*From The Pasadena Post.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping.—THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

To Help Kelly Postal

SIR: In the grim iron-barred Stillwater State Penitentiary in Minnesota sits Kelly Postal, secretary-treasurer of Minneapolis Teamsters, Local 544-CIO. He is serving a five-year sentence on a charge of "embezzlement."

Postal is no more guilty of such a crime than other CIO officials who transferred funds from one federation to another at the direction of their membership. Postal was found "guilty" of obeying the mandate of his local union to transfer the union funds to the Union Defense Committee, and through that committee to the CIO, when Local 544 disaffiliated from the AFL. This vote was taken at a regular meeting by a majority of the members.

Postal was never at any time accused of misusing these funds for his own personal use.

At a previous trial, on the same charges, Judge Hall directed the jury to discharge the case.

Among the nationally known persons backing the pardon campaign for Kelly Postal are Oswald Garrison Villard, Roger Baldwin, A. J. Muste, Norman Thomas and John Dewey. Among the many noted citizens of Minnesota supporting the pardon drive are Charles Egley, secretary, Farmers' Union Livestock Exchange, St. Paul; the Rev. C. T. R. Nelson, president, St. Paul Branch, NAACP; Frank Boyd, secretary, Twin City Branch, NAACP; Owen Cunningham, member, Minneapolis School Board.

It is a national shame that an honorable trade-union official should serve five years in prison for his loyalty to trade-union democracy.

On October 11 the Minnesota Board of Pardons will meet and consider Postal's petition for pardon. We urge every defender of democracy to write immediately to Governor Edward J. Thye, St. Paul, Minnesota, asking that a full pardon be granted to Kelly Postal.

MORRIS MILGRAM, National Secretary,
New York City Workers' Defense League

Negro Soldiers v. White Civilians

SIR: Your readers may be interested in the enclosed copy of a letter I have just sent to the editor of my home-town paper, The Richmond, Virginia, Times-Dispatch.

Camp Polk, La. LT. HENRY I. TRAGLE

[ENCLOSURE]

SIR: I received both my Times-Dispatch and my New Republic in today's mail. At lunch I read, and was much concerned by, Walter White's account [The New Republic, August 16] of some of the injustices which Negro troops have been subjected to. At dinner I read your reprint of Time's article on the Interracial Meeting in Atlanta. That such a meeting could be held, and particularly that it could be held in Atlanta, is, as the article itself says, "a hopeful sign." The cases cited by White are those which involved extreme physical violence, usually resulting in death. Most of these cases have been reported in the press, usually in the form of a brief paragraph, stating that Private So and So, of Camp Such and Such, was shot and killed by a local officer. In most cases this is all the publicity that such an occurrence receives. Such happenings merit the closest study by the newly formed committee, or council, and their findings should be given the widest publicity.

The attitude of the civilian population toward the Negro soldiers in Louisiana and Texas was a surprise and a disappointment to me. There are thousands of men who wear the uniform of the Army of the United States, and perform their duties as soldiers faithfully and well, but who are treated in their civilian contacts as outcasts and as untouchables. I have talked with many of them in recent months, and almost to a man they agree that the army's treatment of them is fair and just and that they get along very well on the whole with the white soldiers. The treatment they receive from the people of the towns near which they are quartered is another story.

I have seen Negro troops unable to buy cigarettes, razor blades or newspapers in a town of several thousand people where there were half a dozen stores. I have seen Negro troops, after a week or more of maneuvers in the field, denied a few hours' pass to go into town because the authorities indicated that they did not want them on the street. I have seen what could easily have developed into a bloody riot stemmed because a Negro non-commissioned officer was man enough and soldier enough to call his men to attention and march them out of a store after they had been cursed and insulted because one of their number had taken a drink of water from a public drinking fountain. These are not isolated occurrences, they are day-to-day happenings, and as such have become a festering sore that time has done nothing to heal.

I do not pretend to know the answer to the problem, but I am very conscious of its existence and of the extreme need for intelligent coöperative action in combating it. I do know that such action cannot be fostered by hush-hush methods, that we must cease being tolerant of such gross intolerance, and that such bigoted prejudice must be fought by every educational means available. These men are doing their job and serving their country and they deserve to fare better at the hands of those among whom they must temporarily live. I look forward to the day when I may ask, as I did recently of a volunteer woman worker at a recreational center in a small Louisiana town, "What facilities are there for the colored troops?" and receive, in reply, more than a stare of blank incredulity.

HENRY I. TRAGLE

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Frank A. Chasan, of Chicago, writes to commend our editorial "The Russian Rift," in our issue of September 6. The question why we have opposed democratic movements in Europe can be answered effectively with another question, he says: "Can you cite a single instance in which our State Department acted in favor of democracy and against reaction or fascism whenever it had such a choice?" Mr. Chasan adds, "Whether or not we have a foreign policy, we do have a foreign orientation, and it is clearly and unmistakably in the direction of fascism."

Mrs. D. W. Smith, of Vancouver, British Columbia, tells us that we got the name of the CCF wrong in the article of August 30, reporting its election gains. The correct name of the party is Coöperative Commonwealth Federation.

From United China Relief, in New York City: Twenty-five Japanese Americans donated blood for the Chinese armies at the local Chinese blood bank on September 18.

Whidden Graham, of New York City, writes us that the newsprint situation (The New Republic, August 2) reminds him of an episode thirty years ago. ". . . An agitation by our great advertising sheets—miscalled 'News'papers—for the abolition of the [Payne-Aldrich] tariff tax on newsprint resulted in the defeat of President Taft in 1912. . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The Great American Desert

SUPPOSE there were no short stories. We would have memoirs, sketches, extravaganzas, tales, long or short, humorous, serious, lyrical or trashy. The impulse to write would still be present and, presumably, the impulse to edit and reject, to assemble the year's best work. Superficially, it would make little difference if short stories as such disappeared from the market: the other short forms would easily fill the gap. But if short stories disappeared from the mind; if the psychic entity, "idea for a story," were free to express itself in a variety of forms and to call upon new energies and new designs, the writing of our day would be rewarded by a grant of liberty, a release of imagination.

Look at the year's best work.[1] Though of a somewhat higher average level than last year's collection, the present stories continue the same trend. They deal, among other themes, with childhood sustaining a shock of revelation from the adult world (William Faulkner, "The Bear"; Wallace Stegner, "Chip Off the Old Block"); a miscellany of sexual conflict (John Cheever, "The Pleasures of Solitude"; Vardis Fisher, "A Partnership with Death"; Mary Lavin, "Love Is for Lovers"; Eudora Welty, "Asphodel"); the war as a topic of current events touching on the anxieties of the civilian front, actual fighting not included (Vicki Baum, "This Healthy Life"; Kay Boyle, "Frenchman's Ship"; Irwin Shaw, "Preach on the Dusty Roads").

This covers a very wide range of subject matter, timely as a form of literary comment, but by no means critical or urgent as far as the actual experience of American life is concerned. But though the range of subject matter is wide, the treatment is in most cases almost identical. Loose as it is, the short-story form is highly conventional, and though these conventions have not yet won full academic recognition and support—some stories in the collection might still be considered "advanced"—this is sure to come, for our writers have already succumbed to an academic outlook of their own making. Only two stories out of the thirty deviate significantly from the currently accepted form—a sketch, consisting of childhood reminiscences, "Samuel Blane," by Murray Dyer, and a prose poem, "Threnody for Stelios," by Peter Gray. A third, "An Argument in 1934," by Delmore Schwartz, thrown in as a concession to the *avant garde*, had all its paragraphs numbered when it first appeared in Kenyon Review. Martha Foley lopped off the numbers, altering the story's appearance but not its basic orthodoxy. The rest of the stories in the volume were already written long before they were conceived—an *a-priori* category engulfed them.

These stories were gathered from fourteen magazines, from The Saturday Evening Post to The Antioch Review, from Mademoiselle and Harper's Bazaar to The Yale Review—a fairly representative sampling, though the slicks and near-slicks are in the majority. Despite her disregard of Partisan Review, where at least three excellent stories (too long!) appeared during the year, I have no great quarrel with Miss Foley's editing. The most she could have done was to produce a better collection. It is not her fault if she fails to inspire better stories. Then whose fault is it if story after story runs along in the same vein, the same words, the same pattern?

I believe the short story itself is at fault. Some stories are told, others are made. The first have a natural pattern, illustrated by Sherwood Anderson's best work. The second are based on a study of technique, and it is with these, where technique is learned but never discovered, that my dissatisfaction lies. Evidently, the way to write such a story is first to get an idea for one. A chance recollection or a chance encounter, sometimes a name or a title, or the suggestion of a scene, will do. The present collection offers very little evidence that these ideas symbolize crises in perception, moral anxieties, themes or fantasies deep in an artist's life: they lack the obsession of the personal. Such ideas are afloat in a tradition, and make only an ineffectual entry into the awareness of literature, for they already bear the stale literary semblance of a bookish birth.

Another fault, the greatest one, is that the contrivance of character in a well tailored story is identified with the contrivance of narration. Short-story characters are receptacles for the flow of narrative and they never overflow, nor do they receive their fill. In Robert Gibbon's "Time's End," for example, a story about a plantation owner's failure to move two old Negro women, deeply attached to the soil, from their house in the swamps to a more productive section of the plantation, neither John, the protagonist, nor Mub or Glow, the heroines, have a speck more of reality than is demanded by the minimal conditions of action. Only with Curtis, the incidental villain *ex machina*, a truck driver called in to move the two women, do the outlines of character appear even dimly, and only because he says "nigger" and tramps heavily on the wooden floor.

This is the common failing. Short-story writers divide character delineation between two techniques: description (often no more than the hook of a nose, the line of a mouth, size, shape, hulk) and action (a peculiarity in smoking cigarettes, a way of blinking or walking), and between the two methods reality is constantly running out. The structure of character, its strains and conflicts, are ignored and its emotional pattern which, of all traits, should serve as the fundamental means of psychological identification, is violated in the very act which substitutes the heavy innuendoes of behaviorism for the simple feelings of the inner life. Character becomes no more than a point of density in a story. Where individuals are needed to sustain dramatic tension, up they spring from their bed of words, meeting all requirements but their own. It would be better not to raise a story to dramatic pitch but let it lie lax in the easy tone of sketch or memoir, if the very tension of

[1] The Best American Short Stories of 1943. Edited by Martha Foley. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 428 pages. $2.75.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conflict which creates character is also the means which destroys it. For conflict, in the contemporary short story, is a platitude and a technical device, something which happens when two people get together, in no way involving the will's deep commitment to struggle, a mere trick for getting a story started. But were conflict entertained for its intrinsic psychological interest, character could emerge in vividness of emotions, in the ambivalence of desire and the unity of moral meaning.

It surprises me that stories with so wide a range of subject matter should suffer from faults reducible to a common denominator. For which reason I suspect the form. "... The actual technique of story-telling has seen no startling innovations during the year," says Miss Foley in her foreword to the volume. Evidence, I believe, that the form has settled down to a middle-aged conservatism of thwarting the imagination.

ISAAC ROSENFELD

China Today

Between Tears and Laughter, by Lin Yutang. New York: The John Day Company. 216 pages. $2.50.
Resistance and Reconstruction, by Chiang Kai-shek. New York: Harper and Brothers. 322 pages. $3.50.
Is There Democracy in China?, by Creighton Lacy. New York: The John Day Company. 154 pages. $1.50.
China: A Portrait Survey of China and Her People, by Kwok Ying Fung. Photographs edited and arranged by Fritz Henle. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 192 pages. $5.

DURING THE PAST TEN YEARS, Lin Yutang has earned a well merited reputation in this country as a brilliant and delightful interpreter of the wisdom and beauty of Chinese civilization. Perhaps more than any other writer, he has contributed to American understanding of the Chinese philosophy of life, and thus helped to strengthen our friendship for the Chinese people and our belief that this friendship must constitute one of the basic foundations of the post-war world. Dr. Lin's latest book, "Between Tears and Laughter," therefore comes as a disappointment and a shock. In it he discusses the most urgent issues of our time: the possibilities and prerequisites for an enduring peace, and the future relations between Asia and the Western world. But instead of wisdom, balanced judgment and constructive thought, we find a bitter, abusive, cynical diatribe, filled with amazing distortions of fact and untenable generalizations.

In angry and unrestrained terms, Dr. Lin denounces the materialism and corruption of Western civilization, as manifested in imperialism, power politics and racial arrogance toward the peoples of Asia. For him, the chief villains on the world stage are not the Axis powers, but reactionary statesmen and political theorists in Britain and America, with their sinister and hypocritical plans for establishing peace on the basis of Anglo-American world hegemony. Present United Nations military strategy appears to Dr. Lin's embittered eye as nothing but a deliberate and malicious attempt on the part of the British and American governments to betray and blockade China as part of their long-term scheme to keep the countries of Asia permanently in colonial subjection.

No one can deny that dangerous reactionary forces exist in the Western world, but to present these forces as though they held unchallenged supremacy in Western civilization is a distortion of reality that can serve no useful purpose. The major weakness of Dr. Lin's book is his attitude of cynical pessimism regarding the popular forces opposing reaction throughout the world. He admits that the common people of all countries, including Britain and America, want peace based on freedom and equality for all nations, but he has little faith that they can make their wishes felt. In a chapter revealingly entitled "Defense of the Mob" he has a patronizing word to say for the instinctive goodness of the common man, but the main stress is placed on his contention that the demands of public opinion are easily circumvented in a modern democracy such as the United States, and that the people are continually hoodwinked and misled by their governments, diplomats and "experts"—both military and civilian.

In effect, Dr. Lin dismisses the popular movements in all countries as insignificant and ineffective in overcoming the forces of reaction. This is all the more inexcusable in view of the fact that he himself is a citizen of a country with the most powerful popular movement in Asia. Had Dr. Lin seen fit to analyze the aims and achievements of the Chinese people, he might have found cause to temper his excessive bitterness and pessimism. The machinations of imperialists can never hope to succeed in Asia, for example, if the Chinese people win their struggle to become strong and independent, economically and politically. Dr. Lin might have served a more constructive purpose if he had included an appraisal of the conflicting forces within the China of today, instead of venting his wrath exclusively on China's Western allies.

This all-important question of China's internal development forms the central theme of Creighton Lacy's "Is There Democracy in China?" The author finds proof of democracy in ancient China in the respect for the individual, the democratic character of village government and the absence of racial or religious discrimination. A deeper analysis of the political life of China during her centuries of feudalism could successfully dispute some of Mr. Lacy's contentions. Nevertheless, it is true that the spirit of democracy, if not the form, has permeated Chinese life for many centuries.

When he comes to the discussion of present-day China, Mr. Lacy is quick to admit that the system of one-party rule, with all political power monopolized by the Kuomintang, runs counter to Western ideas of political democracy. Nevertheless, he is confident that China will emerge from the war a strongly democratic nation, and appears to accept the Kuomintang theory, first enunciated by Sun Yat-sen, that the Chinese people must pass through a period of "tutelage" to prepare them for full self-government. What Mr. Lacy fails to point is that Sun Yat-sen envisaged this process being directed by a broadly representative, nationalist party, embracing all sections of the population, such as the Kuomintang was during his lifetime, and not by a powerful, conservative bureaucracy, such as it is today. We may accept the thesis that the Chinese are an innately democratic people, but we must go further and recognize that the "tutelage" theory is no longer in accord with the realities of Chinese political life. The very fact that a one-party govern-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment is compelled to use strong repressive measures to remain in power is only part of the overwhelming evidence that the Chinese people are prepared and eager to practise democracy, and that China's powers of resistance would be greatly strengthened by giving all patriotic parties and groups a responsible share in the conduct of their country's affairs.[1]

An illuminating history of China's wartime development is provided in "Resistance and Reconstruction," a collection of Chiang Kai-shek's most important speeches and public statements covering the period from July, 1937, to January, 1943. These vividly depict both the progressive and reactionary forces operating in wartime China. On the other hand, we find the inspiring and far-sighted statesmanship that has characterized China's attitude with regard to the war aims of the United Nations and to her own responsibilities in the post-war world: the emphasis on world coöperation; the rejection of the idea of regional domination by strong powers and, specifically, the statement that China does not intend to replace Western imperialism in Asia with an imperialism or isolationism of her own; the recognition that "patriotism is not enough" and that strong nations must accept rational limitations on their sovereignty in the interest of international coöperation.

On the other hand, we find many evidences of the acute internal tensions and strains that menace Chinese unity and weaken China's powers of resistance. The "feudalistic provincialism" which the Generalissimo so strongly condemns still obstructs the full mobilization of China's economic resources. And from his discussion of the role of the guerrilla forces in the border regions of China, one may gain an insight into the obstacles to the growth of political democracy in Kuomintang China. Unfortunately, the Generalissimo's statements tend to confirm the erroneous belief that opposition to one-party rule by the Kuomintang is confined to the Chinese Communists. That this is not the case is shown by the fact that a number of other parties, many of them even more conservative than the Kuomintang, have formed a federation to work for the extension of political democracy. These groups contend that political unity cannot be achieved by force, and that the Kuomintang's efforts to suppress all other parties is a threat to national unity and weakens Chinese resistance. It is their hope, and the hope of all friends of China, that Chiang Kai-shek will become the leader, not of one party, but of a united, democratic nation and thus ensure that the age of Western imperialism in Asia is definitely at an end.

Those who wish an introduction to Chinese civilization, and who seek to appreciate the kaleidoscopic nature of modern Chinese life with its constantly changing blend of old and new, will welcome the beautiful pictorial survey of Chinese life by Kwok Ying Fung. In 84 full-page photographs and a few thousand words of explanatory text, he portrays China's art and architecture, religion, industry and the daily life of her people, leaving the reader with an impression of the dignity and simplicity of ancient China, coupled with the strength and vigor of a modern people whose eyes look to the future rather than to the past.

KATE L. MITCHELL

[1] Chiang Kai-shek's promise that China is to have a democratic constitutional government after the war was discussed in an editorial in The New Republic of September 27, 1943. – THE EDITORS

Novels and Negroes

The Darker Brother, by Bucklin Moon. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 246 pages. $2.50.

IN "THE DARKER BROTHER," his first novel, Bucklin Moon has attempted a difficult feat, the crossing of the great abyss between the white man's world and the Negro's, and of understanding what he finds on the other side. Out of his dogged desire to understand, without exploiting the Negro world unfairly for either its color or its tragedy, he writes a good book.

It is the story of Ben, a twelve-year-old, who journeys up the Seaboard Railroad from Florida to Harlem with his widowed mother and little sister. "What New Yawk like, yuh reckon?" his friend Henry asks when Ben comes to say goodbye. "Doan know yet," says Ben; but in the next decade he learns. First there is the white school where he is entered by his uncle, Rafe Randall, a self-made man in the numbers racket. Ben gets a beating in Central Park from three white pupils and is told to stay in Harlem where he belongs. When they had lured him to the park under the guise of friendship, Ben had "hurriedly followed them, not saying much because of his bashfulness, but so content to be with them that he could have shouted." Out of the author's genuine appreciation of what these spiritual defeats do to people, the characters take on life and motion and meaning.

Ben stays in Harlem and learns to hate "ofays"—white people. He pals around with Slick, a warped boy in a zoot-suit whose laceration is a cramped, shoddy apartment to which he is ashamed to take his friends. Ben himself has things better; but finally the Dutchman moves in on the Harlem policy racket and his uncle, betrayed by a light-skinned hellcat of a mistress, is killed.

Ben really begins to learn what New York is like for a Negro. His mother, who could never break away from her memories of the warm sun of Florida and the years when her husband was alive, finally enters one of "Father Gabriel's" Heavens and retreats into hallelujah. Ben is almost a man now. He is in love with Birdie, a loyal girl whose own family has long ago been broken up and who has to scrabble out a living as maid-cook-nurse ($50 a month) for a succession of white employers. She and Ben live together—toward the end of the 1930's when white America had just about decided not to give the Negro a job. Unemployment and miserable insecurity do to Ben what they do to most people. He meets up with Slick again and they roll drunks. Finally Slick steals a car. In a mad, exalted moment when he feels that for the first time his life has come to have a meaning, he roars down the highway to his death. Ben enlists in the army; it is better than rotting in Harlem. From the Southern training camp he writes home lonely, tender letters to Birdie. And Birdie, during a shameful period when she has become a hustler in order to buy food, has only her memory of him to cling to. Their love is the most plausible and richest element in the novel.

The book ends on a cheerful note—and in a manner probably not true to life—with Ben home on furlough with Birdie, who has been restored in good standing with a kindly family she had worked for. At home in their room they hear of Pearl Harbor on the radio, and Ben packs to leave. He wants to fight, even in a Jim Crow

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army; all over the world, here, in China, in India, the colored man must fight. "We all men right on only most white men don't know it yet. Some do but most don't. We got to show 'em all over the world."

For about the first third of the pages Mr. Moon shoulders and bumps his way along, learning how to write this first book. There is uneasy transition from scene to scene, like a crudely edited home movie. But the feeling in this book is its strength. Scenes begin to build up real poignance. And finally, when Slick is careening his stolen automobile down the starlit road, or the drunken, lonely, terrified Negro soldier is about to hang himself in the Southern camp, one realizes that Mr. Moon is a genuine writer, capable of handling this difficult subject.

The subject matter of this book raises a critical point that seems important. There have already been many race books growing out of the wartime crisis, from deep sociology to shallow I'll-take-my-stand declamations by Southern whites, to books by Negroes challenging this stand, which on the whole have simply been better written. Now we shall see the novels by white folks, following after Mr. Moon's. Others scheduled soon are "Strange Fruit" (Reynal and Hitchcock), by Miss Lillian Smith of Clayton, Georgia, who edits and writes the racial magazine, South Today, with power and eloquence, and "The Dark Stain," by Benjamin Appel (Dial).

The point raised is that, with these and other novels, the Negro is going to take a new status in American fiction, as he has in life. Serious white writers in increasing numbers will enter Richard Wright's field of protest. The Negro's own fight for political and social equality is forcing this change in literature. In white men's books he is going to stop being a "nigger"—no matter how subtly this stereotype has been established heretofore—and become a person. I doubt if we are going to see much more Amos-'n'-Andy writing in the "slicks." I believe the mumbo-jumbo semi-supernatural Negroes of Southern "realists" like William Faulkner henceforth must face sharper examination to determine if all this ectoplasm is chemically pure. (It is a shame to single out Faulkner always—an artist—but he has been the bellwether.) Much of this Southern race writing, offered and accepted as realism, has been nothing more than a flight into fury to escape an agonizing reality and an obligation. Negroes are people. They suffer just as intensely as white people; they get just as hungry. What has happened to them is a vast, cruel story. The South was built by their toil and suffering. So were Northern fortunes. So were English cotton-textile cities like Liverpool and Manchester. The Southerners must start to tell it right.

A war is being fought all around the globe, by many nations and all races, to determine whether people are going to be free to be people, not more, not less. If the gabbing of old Mr. Hull thrusts us down into cynicism and we think momentarily the war is being fought for other things, our cynicism is deceiving us; this war is raising problems and it is going to make their solution inevitable, no matter what we get in a Tennessee drawl or clipped Groton accents on the radio. Before this war, our writers, even our artists, could indulge themselves—and the rest of us "ofays"—in the luxury of telling fables about Negroes; but now they must begin to tell it straight.

THOMAS SANCTON

Money and Men

Out of Debt, Out of Danger, by Jerry Voorhis. New York: Devin-Adair Company. 238 pages. $3.

MONEY IN ANY SANE ECONOMY must be the ready means of moving from producer to consumer all the goods and services the producers can turn out if everyone is employed. Money should *not* be a factor which decides whether goods and services are to be moved from producer to consumer."

Jerry Voorhis hoists this flag and wades into the great monetary melee, shooting from both hips. He establishes to my satisfaction the following points:

1. Modern money has cut loose from gold and now consists of currency and demand deposits, or "check money." The latter is by far the more important.

2. Our 15,000 commercial banks create check money as they please, limited only by "reserve requirements."

3. Thus, in effect, private bankers do the "coining" which the Constitution specifically delegated to Congress.

4. Although this coining function is based on the credit of the whole people, the banks collect interest on it. The interest they will collect on war loans may amount to $100,000,000,000.

5. Mr. Voorhis asks: why shouldn't the people coin their own money as provided by the Constitution and save the interest? Why shouldn't we use our national credit to issue "costless money"?

6. The war has greatly aided our fiscal education by making it clear even to people with low IQ's that money no longer need limit production. We can "afford" anything, up to the limit of our manpower and materials. Throughout the depression we were cursed with the contrary concept. We had a vast surplus of men and materials, but thought we could not "afford" to put them to work.

7. The totalitarian states, including our ally Russia, now refuse to limit production by financial barriers. Such is the competition we are up against. The problem is to find a way within our democratic framework of making money an agent of full employment.

That way, says Mr. Voorhis, is to take over the Federal Reserve System by paying $144,000,000 for the stock in the Reserve banks, and thus restore to the nation the right to "coin" money. If the government owned the Federal Reserve Banks it could deposit non-interest-bearing bonds with them and receive a checking account in exchange. Thus it could not only save the interest burden but also exert a more direct control over business cycles.

Mr. Voorhis' proposals do not literally relieve us of a national debt. Rather they convert it to a non-interest-bearing basis. The danger of pumping too much money into the economy would still remain, as well as the periodic necessity of paying out of taxes part of the non-interest-bearing debt.

Personally, while I think a campaign for costless money is desirable, I am more concerned with putting land mines under idle money. Various taxation devices could spring the mines. The stock of money in the system is important, but even more important is the *rate at which it moves.*

Mr. Voorhis does not give quite enough weight to this dynamic factor. It is usually safer to stimulate purchasing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power by defrosting uninvested savings than by creating new dollars.

New money, however, is essential as production increases year by year, and Mr. Voorhis appears to have found the long-term answer to that one. He has also written a lively, readable, hard-hitting book. STUART CHASE

Renaissance of Christianity

The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation. Vol. II, Human Destiny, by Reinhold Niebuhr. Gifford Lectures. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 329 pages. $2.75.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY was cradled in great, not to say stupendous hopes—hopes as to man, as to history, as to the universe itself. Whereas the old-fashioned religion had taught that "there is no health in us," that human nature is evil, even sinful, and has to be crushed, we, of the twentieth century, have believed in human nature, holding it to be essentially sound. So much so, in fact, that we have used human nature as our norm and have defined the highest good as the satisfaction of human needs. We have looked to no far-off Kingdom of Heaven, but to the cure of human evils on this earth. And we have believed such a cure to be concretely attainable. Enlighten the mind, spread education through all the classes of society, conquer disease, overcome poverty by a reform of economic institutions, raise the standard of living by the application of science to human needs, advance the front of democracy—has not this been the program of liberalism everywhere? Along with this faith in human nature has gone a belief in a universal law of progress—that somehow humanity is irresistibly marching to its goal and that the very cosmos is conspiring for its success. The faith in progress was really no part of the new scientific mentality—indeed it was hostile to it, being a relic of deism; but still there it was radiating a glow of hope upon the human scene. We were not only confident; we were complacent and arrogant, feeling ourselves Promethean rebels, conquerors both of nature and of the gods.

But now something has happened—a halt has been called; the two wars—or rather the one war in its two phases—with their attendant economic disasters and political chaos, have shattered our simple faith. Our optimism is proved to have been not only shallow but false. Human nature has disclosed unsuspected depths of irrationality, brutality and barbarism; history is not an upward-onward march. Obviously something is very wrong with human nature and with the nature of things. All of this should enable us more readily to see the point of Mr. Niebuhr's book, which, in substance, is a philosophy of history. The book before us is a trenchant critique of the gospel of progress and of all utopianism. History, we are told, is tragic; it does not solve its own problems ("history does not provide its own redeemer"): and man—owing to his involvement in the flux of history—is forever tempted to sin. True enough, history has boundless possibilities, but these are ambiguous—possibilities of good *and* of evil. Every possible achievement opens up new potentialities of frustration; "in the field of culture this means that the realization of a higher truth can lead to a new falsehood."

In human relations, advance in technology, especially in transportation, while making for more understanding also creates new sources of friction. And the plan for a world organization, admirable in itself, will if realized offer new dangers of imperialism on a grander scale than before. Human institutions do not succeed unless the human will which uses them is good. However much we improve and revolutionize our economic and political structure, so long as greed and love of power remain, man can abuse and exploit the system for selfish ends. And the battle against ambition and selfishness is perpetual; victory, if won, is never final. It has to be rewon for every generation, for every new act of human decision. There is no *inheritance* of goodness, even from moment to moment.

This is somber doctrine; to be sure, there is comfort in the thought that grace redeems man but, lest we be too easily comforted, the author adds that grace breaks the power of sin in principle but not in fact. In short, history is subject to the judgment and to the wrath of God. Perfection exists only outside history; the City of God is set over against the city of man.

But if human nature is corrupt and history tragic, why do anything? Why not give up this life and its aims, become a monk and wait for death as a prized release from this mortal coil? This is in effect the teaching of classicism, especially of Plato: that history is a meaningless cycle of birth and decay, that matter and finite personality are evil, and that man must seek refuge in a union with the timeless. At this point, Christianity sharply diverges from Platonism. History, though tragic, is nevertheless meaningful. It is not involvement in the body and in finiteness which

Must we abandon the "Century of the Common Man" for an

American Empire in Asia?

What are we going to do about Japan after we beat her? How close will we stay to Australia, to Russia, to China? What, too, of India and the Near East, and of all the colonies, in the post-war world? Here, hard questions are given hard-headed answers by a leading expert on world affairs

ALBERT VITON

"Packed with important information, written with poise and judgment, and argued with sagacity."—Hallet Abend, *Book-of-the-Month Club News.* $3.00

JOHN DAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is evil, but rather man's arrogant denial of this involvement. In a masterly exposition, the author repudiates the classical ideal of otherworldliness and of dissociation from the bodily nature, from individuality and from flux. Christianity affirms the value of the historical and the personal. Surely this is the meaning of the Incarnation and the Atonement; God has revealed himself in the flesh and in history; therefore it must be that the body has spiritual value and that history is the locus of the eternal. Human historical acts have absolute significance; how, now and on this earth, I meet my problems counts in "heaven." Piety does not annul morality, but enforces my duty to work for social justice and to improve social institutions.

A great number of our intellectuals have grown up to believe that Christianity is dead—a corpse indecently exposed which should be buried. Mr. Niebuhr certainly thinks of Christianity as very much alive. "What!"—the reader may ask—"does he bring back Sin, the Inspiration of the Bible, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the Body, a Personal God, Justification by Faith, and all the other ghosts?" Exactly so. "But is not this a supine retreat?" No—it is a Renaissance of Christianity. The author is eminently successful in exhibiting Christianity not merely as a religion but as a philosophy too; one which is unique—not a restirring of the Greco-Roman kettlepot; and one which is adequate. Christianity had seemed to be dying, not merely owing to attacks from the outside, but owing to internal inanition; to those who still believed in it, it had become a mere habit. Mr. Niebuhr revitalizes the doctrine by presenting it in a fresh light and vividly; and he succeeds in exhibiting it as a comprehensive, systematic and rational philosophy (including its philosophy of faith).

RAPHAEL DEMOS

A Reader's List

THE INVASION OF GERMANY, by Curt Riess (Putnam's, $2.50). Any analysis of military affairs which goes beyond the merely factual, must inevitably point toward the future. The most valuable analysis will naturally be the most vulnerable, since it will be specific, in a position to be either brilliantly confirmed or crushingly refuted by events. Mr. Riess places a nearly equal emphasis on all branches of warfare and achieves an analysis which is difficult to challenge, but equally easy to accept or ignore. His main, more controversial, thesis, that ruthless invasion of Germany is a political as well as military necessity, is propped by, at least, one non-sequitur, namely, that this war is a consequence of the lack of such an invasion in the last, and is, admittedly, the product of hatred as well as reason.

HISTORY OF MACY'S OF NEW YORK, 1858-1919, by Ralph M. Hower (Harvard University, $3.75). The story, till 1919, of a department store so large that it might be called an *imperium in emporio*. The author, who teaches in the Harvard School of Business Administration, writes primarily for merchandising executives, but much of his material will interest the general reader as well—especially when he describes the somewhat fantastic career of Rowland Hussey Macy, the Nantucket Yankee who founded the big store in 1858.

TRAGEDY AT LAW, by Cyril Hare (Harcourt, Brace, $2.50). This unusual novel of murder concerns a judge of the High Court on Circuit in southern England, with the still unchanged ritual and an imposing entourage of Marshals, High Sheriffs, Under Sheriffs, Clerks, etc. The neat points of law that come up, plus some likable characters and much good talk, compensate for the rather slow pace (the murder isn't committed until page 260). Mr. Hare's command of his subject makes this an extremely interesting book.

Contributors

J. T. HARRIS is a free-lance writer living in London.

HEINZ H. F. EULAU was until recently Senior Propaganda Analyst for the Department of Justice. He has a doctorate in Political Science from the University of California and contributes to many journals in the fields of politics and economics.

RICHARD J. BEAMISH is a former member of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (1937-43). He has worked as writer, editor or business manager for five Philadelphia newspapers.

CHARLES MADGE is a contemporary English poet, the founder, with Tom Harrisson, of Mass-Observation. He is also one of the editors of the "Target for Tomorrow" series which publishes such pamphlets as "Industry After the War—Who's Going to Run It?"

H. H. BENNETT is director of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture.

HENRY DAVID GRAY is a professor emeritus of English at Stanford University. His published work has been chiefly articles in the various philological journals on Shakespeare and his contemporaries.

KATE L. MITCHELL is the author, among other books, of "India Without Fable." She is a member of the editorial board of Amerasia, and of the International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations.

STUART CHASE is a noted writer on economic and sociological subjects. He is the author, among other works, of "Idle Money, Idle Men" and "A Primer of Economics."

RAPHAEL DEMOS is associate professor of Philosophy at Harvard University.

HILLTOP LODGE
ON BEAUTIFUL SYLVAN LAKE
R. R. Sta., Pawling, N. Y.
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.
Only 65 Miles from New York City
Every Sport & Recreation • Golf Free
P. Wolfson & S. Rothauser, Directors
N. Y. Office: 277 Broadway • CO 7-3958

EVERY MINUTE... A JOYFUL MEMORY
On shore of sand lake. Modern. Steam heat. Boating, bathing, tennis, handball, softball. Splendid food. Open all year. Reasonable rates Write to Thom. R. Smith or N. Y. Off. LO. 5-3716.
LAKE REST HOTEL
SHANDELEE, LIVINGSTON MANOR, N.Y.
Rates upon Request

RUSSIAN Language Courses
Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced
AMERICAN RUSSIAN INSTITUTE
56 West 45th St. New York City
MUrray Hill 2-0312
REGISTER NOW
New Term Begins October 4th

WEARING APPAREL
DISCRIMINATING women will be happy to learn about Miss Goodman's Dress Shop. Here are clothes of simplicity and quality at normal prices and with personalized attention. Miss Goodman, 862 Lexington Avenue, near 41st Street. MU 5-0870.

LANGUAGES
BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet B. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, New York City.

PLAYWRITING
Lajos Egri author of the Simon & Schuster best seller HOW TO WRITE A PLAY will accept students for semesters in writing of plays, novels and stories. Classes for PROFESSIONALS and BEGINNERS.
Contact EVELYN CORNELL
21 East 21st Street, Brooklyn, BU 4-5329

ORDER YOUR BOOKS — ALL BOOKS — mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.
POSTAGE FREE
from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 East 49th Street New York 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED